Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BX8 .K67
Knauff, Theodore Christian MAIN
Other sheep I have
3 9967 00250 9649

BX8

ACCESSION NUMBER 40,238 SHELF NUMBER ~~B-665065~~

The Virginia Library
McCormick
Theological Seminary
of the
Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the _____ Fund.

RECEIVED April, 1915.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_W9-CWU-183

OTHER SHEEP I HAVE

BY

THEODORE CHRISTIAN, pseud. of

Theodore Christian Knauff

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CELESTIAL COMMISSION ON CHURCH UNITY

"Truth embodied in a tale
May enter in at open doors."

MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
NEW YORK AND LONDON
The Knickerbocker Press
1911

Copyright, 1911
by
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

8
K67

NOTE

IN the following pages certain opinions expressed by imaginary characters in the work are really the opinions of learned authorities in the churches represented by the speakers, or of persons of the type of character depicted, credit for which is given by foot-notes. These have not been put in quotation marks, in order to give the impression that the words emanate from the character who utters them, that the continuity of the story may not be interrupted, and that the reader may not be confused. Some of these quotations are in the exact words of the original.

The author acknowledges his indebtedness to the various publishers and authors mentioned in the foot-notes for their kind permission to use the citations from works appearing under their imprint.

40238

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Alpha.	How it Happened	1
Beta.	How the Journey Began	5
Gamma.	On the Way	10
Delta.	The Arrival	24
Epsilon.	The Inquiry Begins	45
Zeta.	The Testimony of Romanus	91
Eta.	England to the Rescue	129
Theta.	Of Such Stuff Were Martyrs Made	158
Iota.	In Line with Christ's Messengers	168
Kappa.	By their Fruits ye shall Know them	186
Lambda.	In Beauty's Name	193
Mu.	A Safe Stronghold Is Our God	207
Nu.	See here is Water, what doth Hinder me to be Baptised?	223
Xi.	As the Voice of Many Waters	233
Omikron.	And how shall they Preach unless they be Sent?	245
Pi.	In the Multitude of Councillors	260

		PAGE
Rho.	East, West, Hame 's Best . .	292
Sigma.	One—of Many	296
Tau.	He hath Sent me to Heal the Broken-Hearted . . .	303
Upsilon.	Rich in Saving Common-Sense And, as the Greatest only Are, In his Simplicity Sublime . .	310
Phi.	It Is the Lord's Doings—Marvellous	321
Chi.	But the Greatest of These . .	344
Psi.	Eye hath not Seen, nor Ear Heard, the Things which God hath Prepared	358
Omega.	The Prayers of David the Son of Jesse are Ended . . .	364

APPENDICES

I.—The Extent of the Universe . . .	367
II.—The Beginning of Early English Christianity	371
III.—The Early Anglican Church . . .	375
IV.—The Independence of the Church of England	379
V.—The Organic Continuity of the Church of England	381
VI.—The Nag's Head Fable	383

OTHER SHEEP I HAVE

LIBRARY
OF
McCORMICK
THEOL. SEM.

Other Sheep I Have

ALPHA

How it Happened

WHETHER I have been in the body, or out of the body, or present in the body but absent in spirit, I know not.

Though I cannot find that I have been missing here upon earth, I have been caught up into the seventh heaven, I have been living another life and for an indefinite time. Time, did I say? What is time? I have lived years since last on earth and yet have I not been missing. By reason of what I cannot but believe was Divine command, I have been with Him with whom one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day.

I am told that I have been dreaming, that I have seen a vision. A dream—lasting so long? The stuff that dreams are made of is in fact of such peculiar texture that in many well authenticated instances, where the proof was beyond dispute, but a fraction of ordinary time was necessary to cover years of dream life. But this is something different, and the proof is not wanting.

On my desk before me is a pile of manuscript, a portion of what is now spread before you on these pages. Did I write this great quantity in an ordinary dream? I may.

Such things have been known.[1] But it would have been a physical impossibility to have written it in a few moments. According to my recollection, which is very clear, it was written by Divine command. And so distinct is the impression retained that I did as I am convinced I was commanded, and have finished it from recollection, for the guidance of my fellow mortals. I have apparently been recalled from another life expressly for that purpose. I had no alternative. There was every reason that I should obey. There was no reason why I should not. I have so done and the result is before you.

It may perhaps be thought that I arrogate to myself great importance by claiming to be a special messenger

[1] A THEOLOGICAL STUDENT WHO WROTE SERMONS WHILE ASLEEP.—One of the most remarkable and puzzling stories of somnambulism has recently come to light. The subject was a young ecclesiastic at a seminary. The Bishop of the Diocese was so deeply interested that he went nightly to the young man's chamber. He saw him get out of bed, secure paper, compose, and write sermons. On finishing a page he read it aloud. When a word displeased him he wrote a correction with great exactness. The Bishop had seen a beginning of some of these somnambulistic sermons and thought them well composed and correctly written. Curious to ascertain whether the young man made use of his eyes the Bishop put a card under his chin in such a manner as to prevent him seeing the paper on the table before him, but he still continued to write.

Not yet satisfied whether or not he could distinguish different objects placed before him, the Bishop took away the piece of paper on which he wrote and substituted several other kinds at different times. He always perceived the change because the pieces of paper were of different sizes. When a piece exactly like his own was substituted he used it and wrote his corrections on the places corresponding to those of his own paper. It was by this means that portions of his nocturnal compositions were obtained. His most astonishing production was a piece of music written with great exactitude. He used a cane for a ruler. The clefs, the flats, and the sharps were all in their right places. The notes were all made as circles, and those requiring it were afterward blackened with ink. The words were all written below, but once they were in such very large characters that they did not come directly below their proper notes, and perceiving this, he erased them all and wrote them over again.—*London News.*

from the Most High, but if the work had to be done by any mortal, I possess peculiar fitness for the work.

I am a servant of the Master, a server at His altar, at what particular one need not now appear. That, however, has not always been my vocation. My former worldly work was to record and tell of man's deeds and misdeeds, a worldly scribe. I have recorded man's words in set speech and deliberative assembly. I was an adept in that calling. While so engaged, the belief came that I was fitted for the Lord's own more peculiar work. I gave up earthly profit for His service. The worldly occupation had its attractions, but I loved the Lord's work more. So I then thought. I have since learned better. What I really wanted were fame, power, influence, standing. These were more attractive than riches. I had my reward. In the place I proposed to fill, that of a great sacred orator, for which I was not fitted, I was unsuccessful. I could not move men nor gain them by my eloquence. Few can. In my study, when that unfitness was most apparent to my understanding, I was restless, unsatisfied, given to dreaming of what I might do, not for the Lord's glory but for my own. When I was really about my Father's business, abroad among the poor and lowly, for which humble work I was well fitted and in which I was most successful, I was contented and happy.

But I did not see the Lord's hand in all this. I was not content to do what it was evidently His will that I should do. I continued the strife for the unattainable, brooding over the absence of gifts which were not mine, and dreaming of impossibilities.

It was in my study in the midst of one of these dreams, when I should have been without, actively occupied with what my hands found to do, that the Lord in His infinite wisdom called me. The call has been my salvation. After the peculiar work, which was then given me, was done, as it now is, I am ready to do His will whenever and wherever it may become manifest.

The manner of this call is indistinct in my recollection, and the manuscript before me does not show it, but that is unimportant. As near as I can remember, the call came by means of a messenger of whose form no likeness remains upon my mind. In essentials everything is clear. In non-essentials, recollections of events are erased from my memory as a line from a tablet.

The message received was to the effect that there was work to be done, for which, by reason of my former and present occupations, I was peculiarly fitted. There was a supernatural event to take place which must be recorded and the record made known to men. Would I undertake the work?

Fortunately my better nature was my guide and I accepted the commission gladly.

"Then," said the messenger, "follow me. Whatever you may see or hear, record and preserve, or fix it in memory so that it may be written."

Hence it was that on giving my assent I found myself floating away in space as in a dream, without will of my own, not caring whither, at peace with myself and all men, on the Master's business. All that I have seen no brush can depict, no pen can describe, no tongue can tell, but what is permitted I impart as far as my inadequate faculties will permit, and what has happened upon this earth, I here record as faithfully as any living man had ever recorded fact before.

BETA

How the Journey Began

THE scene was one of great distinctness and yet indistinct. There were present celestial beings with me a terrestrial. There was an ineffable and undefined presence, but one nevertheless fully appreciated by the senses. I felt that I must be standing in the presence of the great Ruler of the universe, but of His form and likeness I can recall nothing.

Words apparently were spoken but in what language I cannot say. But ideas were conveyed as on the great day of Pentecost when all heard in their own tongues the wonderful works of God.

More defined than the Ineffable Presence was a being to whom apparently was being given certain directions, a being not God, not man, not angel, with a body of exceeding beauty, a face of wondrous kindness, every motion, every utterance, every look betokening God's well trained and faithful servant.

I caught the sense, not the wording of the directions given:

"Our well beloved and faithful servant. Thou hast heard of that most distant atom in our universe, of infinitesimal size, least among the many inhabited worlds as they are among the uninhabited, a mere satellite of smallest size of one of our smallest suns, the little globe called Earth, but yet of great notoriety and of more importance than

any of the myriads of mighty worlds, because to that little earth was sent in former time our own dear Son. It was on this little earth that He, of His own free will, became as man, as such lived, was there vilely entreated, and by men was put to death as man, that these creatures of our creation might be brought back to their first estate and that our power and glory might be shown among them in a way that would appeal to their human intellects. It is Heaven's mystery as well as that of earth."

My knowledge of the science of Astronomy had indeed taught me that our little earth, compared with God's universe, was but as less than a grain of sand upon the seashore. I had often wondered why God in His inscrutable wisdom should have selected it for the manifestation of His power over infinite detail—this earth, a smaller satellite of a smaller sun of the many comprised in the nebula we call our "Milky Way," of which suns about fifty millions are distinguishable to our strongest instruments, and which nebula may be but one of many others like it beyond our ken.

Could human reason be found for the selection of the particular nebula of which our sun is one of the smallest fragments and for the setting apart of that sun and its system; why was a smaller satellite chosen among the more mighty ones belonging to that sun, and being chosen, why did little Palestine have the honour of the residence of Deity rather than one of the mighty empires of the earth?

It must all have been a portion of a lesson to prove that God is great by reason of His power over small things as well as His control of immensity. The astronomer can reveal part of the wonders of God in His greatness. It is the occupation of the servant of God to reveal God's power just as wonderful over littleness.

Surely this speck, our earth, cannot be the only inhabited spot in this great universe.[1] But of all God's inhabited

[1] Of all the evidences of narrow-mindedness and folly I know of no greater one than the stupid belief that this little planet is singled out

worlds, can our little earth be the only place in God's creation where God's creatures have gone astray and where God's own Son has come in person to remedy the evil? Surely such distinction could occur but once and but one world could have such pre-eminence. It is beyond man to appreciate that a soul, the one Godlike attribute of man, is of more importance than millions of worlds which are but playthings to the Almighty. O happy earth! and yet how unhappy to have received such honour disdainfully; to have treated the Godhead shamefully; to have rejected Him ignominiously; we the inhabitants of this earth; so small but yet so important as to be known to every inhabitant of heaven as the scene of God's crowning glory; a mite among worlds but a metropolis among heavens.

The instructions continued:

"From this distant world petitions have come up from our faithful people praying for unity among themselves,—that they all may be one.

"That they all may be one! One in what? They, our people, many of them faithful according to their abilities as human beings, are at enmity among themselves. Since the Son of God was among them dissensions have sprung up, jealousies, wars, strivings one against another. Disagreements, and divisions exist which are unseemly. Our faithful people are disturbed thereby. By reason of these conditions they cannot do their Master's will nor perform His work as they would. They are impotent to remedy the evil and the more so as many of their fellows think these dissensions of no moment, nor do they desire to assist in their removal.

"Now, our faithful servant, these petitions require our faithful attention as most important. Fly speedily. Find this little earth. Take with thee our servant Peace who has been there before. He knows the way and will direct

---

to be the seat of life and that all other heavenly bodies are fiery masses or lumps of ice. Most certainly some planets are not inhabited but others are.—*Tesla.*

thee. Take with thee also our servant Charity, whose influence is as great for good as that of Peace. Between them both the unruly spirits among our people may be brought to a better way. Take also our recording angels, Bonum and Malum. Take also this yonder mortal who may interpret for the benefit of his fellow men. Find the cause of this trouble. Hear fully all who now desire to be heard and others. Learn with certainty what those of our faithful, who are now asking this thing, are willing to do to help bring it about,—if they are in earnest in their petition. Find out if they are willing to give up anything for the end desired—if they will sacrifice aught—if they really desire what they ask. Shouldst thou find that their wishes are really as represented, then ascertain if they are active to bring it about and if not, why they are not. Should some be lukewarm, find why they are content to be so. Should any oppose, find why this is so. See if what these petitioners apparently desire is possible to mortals or desirable,—if it is for their good.

"We send thee not in particular to such as those called Jews, Turks, Infidels, or Heretics, nor to those of any particular organisation, but to all our faithful people,—to all who call themselves by our name in any form.

"But remember thou art not a god. Thou art on that account better suited to understand these mortals who have no Godlike attributes, except in their own imaginations, save that of Soul. Do not order or try to compel. That is not thine instruction. Make but suggestion. Thy mere presence may do much in causing them to think and act for themselves. The very inquiry may cause them to see error. It may shame them for asking that the thing which they might do for themselves should be done for them. Thou art not omniscient nor omnipotent, but for the time thou and thy fellows shall be omnipresent if need be for thy purpose. And thou shalt have the power to compel all or any to come before thee and testify. And more important, not only shall they appear, but thy power shall

compel them to reveal their most inmost hearts, their most secret reasons.

"When most fully informed, return hither with thy knowledge. If thy report be favourable, the prayer of their petition shall be granted. Doubt not but that we might obtain our ends without this means, but trust our wisdom, do our bidding, and go. Fly, Faithful!"

Turning, the faithful servant of the Most High motioned me to follow.

So the journey began.

GAMMA

On the Way

WHERE was that point from which we started? Has it ever occurred to you wise astronomers who through the night study unceasingly God's wonders in the heavens, that perhaps at some time, when you have pointed your so-called powerful instruments at some unknown distant speck in the celestial universe, you may have been looking at that central point around which all worlds and systems of worlds revolve, that which may be heaven itself? You may at such a time have had under your observation the home of the Creator of the universe and the residence of the Mighty Judge, from which He may come at no very distant day to visit us again, not as humble man but in Glory, Might, and Majesty.

Such may have been the point from which we set out on our journey to earth with distance as of no account, with time as no object, one day in the celestial economy being literally and actually the equivalent of a thousand years, and a thousand years as of no more importance than a single terrestrial day.

After the sense of bewilderment, which had overpowered me while in the dazzling splendours of the august presence, had been partly overcome, for those splendours were of such an overpowering nature that it was hardly possible for humanity to witness them with safety, the immediate surroundings began to be more noticeable.

The party was plainly under the direction of that servant

of the Most High to whom it had been given in charge. This supernatural being was not known by specific name but was always addressed by some distinguishing title of great respect. The pilot, with whom he who was directing was in continual conference, was plainly the angel, Peace. As we settled down to the routine of our journey and the place from whence we came faded behind us, it was noticeable that we were apparently moving with incredible swiftness but yet with ease, in the midst of what seemed a boundless ocean of space and intense blackness.

On our earthly oceans we may journey for days together with nothing around but the monotonous scenery of sea and sky. On such a voyage a speck of land occasionally appears, in time developing into a port of call, which, when we arrive, brings change of scene, activity, and objects of interest, and is again succeeded as the voyage continues by the renewed monotony of sea and sky.

The voyage through celestial space was of a similar nature.

As we looked around there appeared in the far distance on all sides, faint specks of light in the starless heavens, mere flickers, uncertainties, hardly distinguishable.

"Is this the way?" asked our supernatural leader, indicating one of these specks towards which Peace was apparently tending. "Is that the world we seek under the Master's direction?"

"No," said Peace, "it is not yet in sight."

"In which direction then lies the way?"

Peace indicated a direction in which I could at first distinguish nothing whatever, but as I strained my eyes and we sped onward I imagined at times that I distinguished a faint uncertain point of light, becoming slightly more distinct as we flew towards it until it became like unto that speck which I had examined when on earth through a powerful telescope; to the unaided eye a mere point in the black heavens, scarcely distinguishable, but which through the telescope becomes an astonishing reve-

lation, a nebula. We call it the cluster in Hercules. One of our noted astronomers, the great Herschel, claimed that it is composed of at least fourteen thousand suns.

But many other similar points of light, in addition to the one towards which we sped, soon became evident, and they became more or less distinct as we passed more or less near. Some developed into indistinct cloud dust, including at times individual stars faintly discernible. They developed at different points, but most of them, before becoming well defined, had been left behind. Even the most enlarged covered but an infinitesimal space in the otherwise unbroken blackness of the firmament. As they passed in review, I recalled the fact that our astronomers had claimed that the true denizens of heaven were not the countless stars which surround us in our own nebulous system but the nebulæ or systems of stars themselves.

At length the point towards which we tended began itself to be more distinct, becoming as defined as a star of small magnitude, increasing to a brighter star, then developing into a cluster and into an enlarged and still enlarging system.

To it our path apparently directly lay as to our destination. As we neared it, it unfolded until it filled full half the heavens, that part which was in front of us contrasting strongly with the intense blackness which we left behind. We aimed directly for the centre of the starry mass.

On we kept until we entered the system itself, when the entire heavens were filled with the most magnificent glittering stars of most surpassing brilliancy.

It was noticeable, however, that only those more adjacent to us sparkled singly. The outer edges of the system were still so distant as to be indistinct, and those edges, as we reached a more central point, reminded me most distinctly of our Milky Way. With that way as a starting-point I tried to trace out other of our familiar star surroundings, for the scene was not dissimilar to that of an earthly night of exceeding and unusual clearness. On all sides were most

interesting forms of heavenly beauty, changing in shape continually as we passed onward. At times quantities of seeming star dust appeared like rocket showers, to disappear again quickly. All manner of devices were formed by the moving masses, spheres, crosses, figures with straight, spiral and angular lines.

But I failed to find in any of the kaleidoscopic changes a single familiar form, though it seemed that we were nearing our sun. We kept rushing onward without apparently aiming for any particular star, Peace still leading the way.

Then it began to be evident that our path had but happened to lie through this magnificent system of starry worlds and that it was not our destination. In the wonder of watching the all-absorbing scene I did not at first notice that in the direction in which we tended there was a comparatively small spot in which no stars or star dust appeared, a little blank in the heavens, which soon became considerable in size and extended until the half of the heavens in front of us was a blank and the glittering hemisphere of worlds was behind us. It was not long before the whole expanse was as when we started, with distant specks more or less distinguishable.

In like manner we passed through or near other similar systems, the whole most forcibly recalling the simile of a voyage on the ocean of space with ports of call at intervals. Then was I fully conscious that none of these wondrous conglomerations of worlds through which we passed was the "Way" or river of worlds in which our sun with its satellites is situated. Others of at least as great magnitude evidently existed and at incalculable distances from us.

As the greatness of the universe was thus made known, an immensity which cannot be expressed in words and which no human mind can really grasp, it seemed that the intention of the Almighty was to show me the insignificance of earth, great as it seems to us, and by such comparison, how small are men, or more particularly, one man.

Were it not that it had been repeatedly urged upon me while on earth to try to understand that it is one of the attributes of Deity to be able to care for small things, for infinite details, which now I began to understand as the only possible explanation of the strange economy of the universe, I should have been overwhelmed. This possibility of infinite detail was as wonderful as immensity, especially when both are conjoined. Human minds infer that immensity infers inability to care for a human atom. Not being Godlike, how can we appreciate such ability? It was a lesson which Peace repeatedly tried to impress upon me during the voyage.

I had been given to self-esteem. I was thus taught humility. I had thought that my life plans as I had laid them out were best and I had rebelled against manifest destiny. It is so no longer. I am now willing to go the way He leads me, to do the work He gives me, saying as I have learned to say, and as I have learned it is the custom to say among those with whom I have been associating—their only motive for action in fact—"It is the Master's will. That is enough. I am content."

As to how we were able to travel these incalculable distances at what must have been a speed greater than that of light,[1] was of course a thing supernatural, but time, by

[1] Light travels at the rate of 185,000 miles a second. The distance from our sun to the earth is 92,500,000 miles, which immense distance light travels in a little over eight minutes. The north star is at such a distance t' at the light which we saw from it last night, left its surface forty-two years ago. If that star were blotted out of the sky we would not know it for forty-two years, for the light that left it before the catastrophe could continue to fall upon our eyes for that length of time. The light from a certain faint star in the constellation of the Dragon takes 129 years to reach the earth.

Arcturus, the brilliant star of the constellation Boötes, which is so conspicuous in the north-western sky during August and September, is called the "King of Suns." Our sun is a mere atom beside it, its diameter being 71,000,000 miles. Its distance from the earth is 11,000,000 times as great as that of the sun; that is to say, 11,000,000 times 92,500,000 miles.

which to measure, with those with whom I journeyed, was a factor which actually did not exist. But judged even by earthly standards, we have biblical authority for the statement that such a thing may be done by the messengers of God. It is stated that Daniel prayed to God and in answer to that prayer the angel Gabriel was caused to "fly swiftly," and he reached Daniel at the time of the evening oblation or within the same day in which the prayer was offered, thus travelling these mighty distances within, at the most, twelve hours.

As our journey continued the number of these assemblies of worlds which lay in or near our path increased to such an extent as to no longer cause wonder.

On an ocean journey, when the monotony of scenery becomes apparent, the passengers give more attention to their fellow travellers. So here, when the surroundings were no longer a novelty, I took more notice of the wondrous beings comprising the company. I desired to converse with them, to learn about them, and to gain from them all knowledge possible.

Not indeed as yet had I had the courage to address directly the wondrous being in charge of the party, that servant of the Most High who had spoken with Godhead direct. The two recording angels were not communicative. Their office seemed to be to observe as if for purposes of record later. But the kind demeanour of the two angels, Peace and Charity, invited confidence. I therefore ventured to ask of Peace, as the servant of God had done previously, if a certain luminous point which I indicated was the world we sought. He said that it was not. When I asked if it was not yet in sight he said:

The earth's orbit around the sun is about 575,000,000 miles in length, and to complete its journey in 365 days it must travel at the rate of about 65,000 miles an hour, which almost inappreciable speed, greater by 2166 times than average railroad speed, is but eighteen miles a second or but $\frac{1}{1023}$ of the speed of light.

"You are from the earth and do not know your own birthplace or how to find it?"

"You will recall that I am a mortal to whom it is not possible, except by special Divine command, to leave our earth while in the body. I have never been from its surface before and know not how it should look from without. When we near it I might recognise some of its features."

"True, I had forgotten. It is hard for such as we are to appreciate such a helpless condition. You have my sympathy and my pity. You are caged as a prisoner. But God in the fulness of time will set you free. Do you not always look forward to that time and pine for it, desiring it as you desire no other thing?"

"Most of us mortals have thought so little about what is beyond that wondrous change that we shrink from it, because unknown, as if it were a thing to dread."

"Do you not believe the Master's promises?"

"We do. We do. But you cannot comprehend the difficulty a mortal has to understand and believe. You do not know the small extent of our powers."

"Your powers were given you from God," said Peace. "If they are hampered it must be largely from your own neglect and want of desire to improve them. They could not have been so created. But as to your world, my recollection is that it is not one of these shining bodies which send out their own rays, but a dull body, a parasite of another world, shining only by borrowed light and not discernible at a distance."

"But how is it that you know this?" I asked. "Did I understand the Ineffable to say that you had been to this little earth before; this little distant world, this parasite? How was that? In what manner and when did it happen? And why was it?"

"Of the when and how I can inform you, but not as to the why. God alone knows that. I was directed to go. That was sufficient. It is our business to obey and ask not why."

"But when was it?" I asked.

"Have you not heard that the Son of God once became the Son of Man as a little mortal child on your earth?"

"I know. I know all that."

"Then do you not remember that part of the message of comfort sent you from God on that memorable occasion by means of His own messengers was, 'Peace on earth—'"

"And 'Good Will to men,'" I added involuntarily. "Good Will. Who is he?"

"'Good Will'? You see that servant of God who leads us, that great being whom we love to obey and who bears the Master's own message? He is that 'Good Will.' He is the embodiment of God's will and particularly expresses the sentiments of God towards men. But should you dare to speak to him, should need be, call him not by his name. He is the vicegerent of God Himself. To God alone belongs such familiarity, as to a well-beloved servant. Address him by some title of respect, and when we arrive upon earth tell your fellow mortals to do so also."

"And was this 'Good Will' also in truth upon earth with you?"

"Your servant Peace was indeed upon earth and Good Will was to have followed according to the Divine plan, but men made that impossible. I, Peace, was to have remained until the Master came again for me in person. 'My Peace I leave with you' was His message."

"And you stayed but a short time upon earth?"

"How could I remain? You who were His professed followers were not men of peace. You strove not against His enemies but among yourselves, wasting your strength for naught. There were envyings, jealousies, contentions, fightings and even wars among you. Among such I could not remain, nor was it the Master's will that I should. As your punishment I was recalled. The absence of Peace was your irreparable loss which since you have felt continuously. It is this loss that has led to all the evils you now deplore. You now ask God's help to overcome them.

In reply He has sent me again and this time with His Good Will, as it was His intention before. We shall now see what can be done. We have no power to rectify the evils against which you pray, only to hear you, but the mere fact that Peace is again among you, particularly when accompanied and guided by God's Good Will, should do much to remedy the ills of which you complain. As the evils have been those of man's own making, man himself could do much to unmake them with the help of our presence and guidance.

"It was the absence of another of God's beings which helped to bring on the disorders which led to my recall. You men set too high a value each on his own individual opinions. You could not think alike. Each thought that no one could be right but himself. There was no mutual forbearance. Now we have with us His servant Charity, who has not been on earth before. You have tried to get along without him. As first made, in God's image, you had some of the attributes of Charity. But you have never cultivated his virtues nor have you ever asked for his help to guide you. Nevertheless God has now sent him to you to be, with myself, of what assistance we may in your need. Though you can yourselves do much, you need help in the work you have undertaken and this help God now sends you in us, his servants. Together we may bring about the end."

"I see! I see!" I gasped. "All of it. God's great mercy! I must make it known to my fellow men. Cannot we hasten, good Peace? I cannot wait."

"Patience, patience, my good mortal! All in good time, as it pleases the Master! That is the lesson that such as you find hard to learn. You have the assurance of a God with the powers of an insect."

"But bear with me, good Peace, if I trouble you. Perhaps, if you will, you can help me to understand that which I cannot now comprehend and about which I have great desire to know."

"If I can help you I am at your service."

"Then, good Peace, explain to me if you can, why it was that for the inhabitants of this little earth—so distant, so insignificant, a fact which I now appreciate as I never did before—why was it that for these men—so helpless, so puny, and yet thinking themselves the equal of Deity, disputing with God Himself, fighting against His power, delighting to oppose His will—why was it, I ask, that for such beings as these the Infinite Godhead condescended to lay aside His Godhead and as a man to visit this little earth and as a man to suffer human death, the most lowly, the most horrible, the most painful?"

"That is not for you to know," said Peace. "I can readily understand that you as a man can hardly appreciate infinite immensity, nor even as easily that other opposite attribute of God, infinite detail. The one is as much typical of Godlike power as the other. You try to grasp immensity when it is shown to you, but when you begin to appreciate it, you cannot at the same time believe that the God of great things can at the same time have the other Godlike power, the care of small things. God can care for many millions of worlds. He can care for your earth out of many millions of inhabited worlds. He can care for you out of many millions of men like you on your earth. He can create and care for an insignificant insect on that earth; one that you would think too small for your notice. Not only that but He is the God of the atoms of life, which your human eyes cannot distinguish even with the help of your most powerful instruments.

"You would doubtless wonder if you could be told that the inhabitants of your earth, of all the inhabitants of other worlds, are the only beings which have left their first estate, have gone astray, and are not as they first came from the hand of the Creator. If that were so or not, what matter? God's power over detail is sufficient to single out this one world for the manifestation of this Godlike power and to do it in His own way, even if that way included the sending

of His own Son to be a man with you. But as to why, that does not concern us. We never ask. What we do not do, you whose human powers are at present less than those possessed by us, His servants and yours, should not attempt. It is His will. That is enough. When it is His will, we are content and ask nothing further."

We continued on our appointed way, as directed by our heavenly guide, rapidly and noiselessly, without apparent destination, until, at length, directly ahead and apparently in the direction toward which we tended, there appeared a speck of light, faintly discernible among those visible, out of the intense blackness which immediately surrounded us.

"Our world at last!" was my involuntary remark.

"No," said Peace.

"Not yet in sight?" I inquired.

"You forget that your world is but a satellite, shining not by its own light and not discernible at a distance."

"True," I said. "Our sun then, is it not?"

"Wait," said Peace.

As we approached this point of light, it resolved itself, as others had done, not into a brighter star but into a cloudy mass of stars, showing that it was a nebula. As we pointed directly for it, it developed, as had those through which we had passed, until we could distinguish individual stars. Then the heavens ahead became covered with them, and then we were surrounded by them, the distant edges of the star river stretching away into the form of that galaxy which is so well known to the inhabitants of the earth. The glittering mass in general was like our well-known heavens, but there was nothing familiar in the details of our immediate surroundings. As we passed near to some beautiful sun it would increase in brilliancy until in size it would appear like one of our planets when showing as an evening or a morning star, only to decrease again as it was left behind.

I again begged of Peace to tell me if our sun were yet in sight. He replied that it was not, but that I should at

least recognise the stars around me as they were those at which I had gazed all my life.

It seemed strange that we should at last be in the nebula of which our sun was one of the constituent parts and yet find it all so unfamiliar. Of course there was a difference in standpoint. Could we be in this system and yet so remote from our sun as to cause the whole outlook to differ so materially. I was sure that we were still distant many millions of miles from our usual viewpoint, but the worlds which make the familiar combinations were so much more distant that this change of point should be of small account. I looked for the Pole Star and the two index fingers pointing it out from Ursa Major but could not locate them. It was possible that some bright stars nearly in line in an unusual quarter of the heavens might be those in the belt of Orion, but I could not be sure.

Peace at length had pity on me and pointed out an individual point towards which we were aiming as our sun. It gradually enlarged until it was of the apparent size of our Venus at its full when seen from the earth, though being a sun, it showed with greater brilliancy.

And now a change appeared in some of the heavenly bodies near which we passed. The sun increased in brilliancy to a marked degree as we continued to approach it, but there were others becoming more prominent though showing with more silvery rays. We passed so near to one of these that it was seen to be illuminated only by the rays from the central sun and, as we passed it, showed with but a portion in light, shaping itself in the form we are accustomed to see in our own satellite, our moon, when, as we say, it is but half full.

"Perhaps it is our outer planet, Neptune," I thought.

And so it proved, for I was able in time to distinguish and properly name other planets, Uranus with a moon, Saturn with moons and rings, and Jupiter with bands and moons. Beyond Jupiter, that mighty counterpart of the earth, I looked for and thought I distinguished that string

of little broken pieces of a world, which the Creator would seem to have made only to break again as soon as completed, as a workman would demolish a faulty piece of work. Beyond these I could not distinguish and looked in vain for the earth; but, while looking in the direction of the sun, a small red star appeared near it, which at once I thought to be the earth only to find that I had been mistaken, it proving to be the planet Mars. Then I reflected that the orbit of the earth must be so small that it would still be invisible in the sun's rays.

Then a small blue star could be detected as it gradually emerged from the line of the sun 's rays.

I looked at Peace. "The earth at last!"

"Yes," said Peace.

"The earth. My home," I thought and was silent until Peace aroused me by pointing to a certain formation of stars which he said that I, as a follower of the Master, would certainly recognise, as it was His sign and His alone, which had been set in the heavens.

As I looked I saw in the sky the figure of a cross made of four beautiful stars.

"You surely know that," said Peace.

I examined the heavens and they were still as unfamiliar as before. As I gazed, however, the recollection came to me.

"The Cross! The Southern Cross, we call it."

"I have never seen it before," I confessed. "Not only have I never been away from the earth's surface but I have never been on the side of the earth from which that formation of stars may be seen, which is the side opposite to my home."

Peace looked at me incredulously but said nothing.

Within the outer edge of the orbit of Mars the disc of the earth was like that of our moon seen from the earth.

As we continued towards our destination we came abreast of the Martian planet. From that point the scene before us was singularly beautiful. The earth like a gigantic moon, wrapped in its soft gauzy atmospheric envelope

of blue was before us, and beneath this, as on a map, familiar outlines of land and sea could be distinguished.

But we stopped not to consider or to marvel at its beauties. Almost as in a flash we had dipped below this gauzy envelope and had landed on the earth's surface.[1]

[1] See Appendix I. "The Extent of the Universe."

DELTA

The Arrival

SO sudden had been the descent that I had failed to notice on what part of the earth's surface we had alighted. The surroundings were strange and there was nothing by which to gain a knowledge of our location. We were in some large land area crowded with tropical vegetation. As it happened there were no human beings in sight.

The leader at once turned to Peace, as the guide familiar with the earth by reason of his former visit, and directed him to find those who were the object of our search; the Christian people whose prayers for unity among themselves had been received by God Himself and in answer to which we had been directed to undertake this journey.

Peace was not familiar with that portion of the earth and he turned to me for information, when I was obliged to confess that I was unable to say where we were.

The surprise and impatience of my angelic guide was quite manifest.

"Now that you have reached your little earth," he said, "you who have never been away from its surface before, do you not know enough about it to know where you are?"

"You must remember, dear Peace, that while to you our earth appears insignificant, compared with our powers it is a mighty universe. We cannot know all of it personally, nor can we explore it thoroughly without the expenditure of much time and money. Money has not been given to all of us freely."

"A puny mortal," interrupted Peace.

"I have, however," I continued, "a certain knowledge of earth gained by study, which I may use to advantage in fixing our locality."

At that moment a number of people came in sight, and from the moment I laid eyes on them I knew in a general way what were our surroundings. The sight of the Southern Cross before we reached the earth had prepared me for a southern location. The half-naked figures with protruding lips, bushy hair, flat noses, and barbarous jewelry, assured me that we were in some of the wilder portions of the continent of Africa.

"Are these the Christians we seek, these mortals whose prayers for unity we are here to answer?" inquired the leader.

Though I had not previously spoken directly to that august personage the question was so startling that I at once summoned courage and answered:

"These are not Christ's followers. They know nothing of God except as a being of their own imagining. They know nothing of Christ. They are heathen."

"Know not of Christ and on this earth on which He died! He, the son of God! Impossible!"

"It is, alas, only too true."

"And are not these people some of those whom He died to save?"

"They are but they do not know it."

"Why have you not told them?"

"They are many and we are few and our powers are limited. Besides they are far away and we have many like them at our very doors whom we have not the means to reach."

"Why cannot you reach them?"

"Because we are too feeble at the best, and what is more, we do not work together. We have no system, no organisation. We waste our efforts by scattering rather than concentrating. Besides it is as much as we can do to maintain

our own organisations against those who should be working with us but who are against us."

"Then why maintain them? Is it worth while? Have you no head to direct how you should work?"

"Our head is Christ and we follow His orders, but we do not all interpret them alike. We each try to do as we believe He commands but we differ."

"Then you follow not Christ but your own interpretation of His commands."

"It is so, Sire, and the pity is that it is so. But what can we do? We wish it different and it is for help to change these conditions that we appeal."

"We shall see what can be done. But these heathen—how many of them are there on this earth?"

"Millions and millions. The followers of Christ of all kinds are but a small proportion of the inhabitants of the earth."

"Alas! Alas! And He died to save them all! And how do you account for it that it is so?"

"Men have gone astray. They trust in their own powers and they are inadequate. They work in their own way or not at all."

"Are they not willing to give up their own way when the results show that way to be wrong?"

"Alas! No, Sire. They claim their way is of God. Show them the right way and keep them to it. You are not a mortal or you would appreciate our difficulties."

"It would seem that we should have to change the mortal nature before anything further can be done. Mortals will first have to be taught what not to do before they can be taught what to do. The waste of strife among you must stop and you must consider the opinions of others as good as your own."

"Yes," said Peace, "if only Charity and myself had been allowed to remain among you."

"As to the particular people here before you," I urged further in extenuation, "they are almost as brute beasts.

Their intelligence is of a lesser order than that of a brute. They know not of God nor would they understand if they did. To teach them of Christ we should first have to teach them how to understand such knowledge, and it would be more easy to make a beast to understand."

"Not so," replied the leader. "Ignorant they may be, but have they not souls, the one Godlike attribute of man, which no beast, intelligent as he may have been made by God, a creation of to-day and gone to-morrow, can possibly possess?"

"But," continued the august Being, turning to Peace, "let us seek some more worthy spot on this earth. Lead the way to that part you know of where the Master Himself dwelt. There at least we shall see the results of His great condescension."

At once we were again in the air with Peace, as by instinct, leading. As we neared the surface again Peace spoke as to himself:

"Yes, this is familiar. It is the place. Here the Master lived; here He died, here He was buried, here He rose again, and from here He began His journey back to Heaven."

Judea it was. As we approached it all the members of the heavenly company showed the greatest interest, the greatest reverence, the greatest humility. So intense were their feelings that they spoke not at all until we were on that favoured land and in sight of that favoured city, now but a shadow of its former self.

Turning to me the leader said:

"And who is Christ's representative here? It seems not the place we expected. There is nothing to show that this is the mighty stronghold of Christ's followers, the centre for you Christians, a little heaven on earth as it should be."

"Alas, again, O Sire. It is with sorrow I confess it. Though there are Christians in this land they do not rule. It is ruled by Moslems. They are called Turks and

Infidels. In past ages Christians have striven by force of arms to take it from them but unsuccessfully."

"By force of arms? Christians! Fighting! And about the land in which the Prince of Peace lived and died! If they wanted it could they not get it by other methods? But how did they lose it? Surely here, where Christians were first known, they were strong in numbers. But what are Moslems, Turks, Infidels?"

"Turks they are by nationality. Infidels they are as to the Christian faith. They are the bitter enemies of Christians. They hate the sign of the cross. They are the followers of a false human prophet, who while knowing God, deny Christ."

"Is the land then still the land of the Jews though Moslems rule?" asked Peace.

"Jews there are for they are everywhere, scattered throughout the world, with no abiding place particularly their own, but not here more than elsewhere."

"Are none of them Christians?" asked the leader.

"Some are and from many nationalities of the earth but they agree not. With great changes of earthly empire, the seat of greatest Christian strength went elsewhere. From here the belief in Christ spread throughout the world. Reaching to many lands, in each it took on national characteristics. The believers in many lands incorporated their national characteristics with their religious belief and though all holders of the same faith, their national antipathies cannot be reconciled, particularly when dwelling in one land as here. Here are gathered, with unbelievers, representatives of nearly every Christian nation upon earth, who agree not, nor desire to."

"Then from this Christ land has come none of these prayers for unity?"

"No, Sire. Not to my knowledge. I speak but from hearsay. Personally I know nothing of this land."

"You have not been here either,—do not know personally this place of all places on earth, the scene of our Saviour's

death? Shame on you, Mortal! But let us leave this place! It is defiled. We cannot abide such infamy. Can God's own creatures, such as you, stand such insult, look calmly at such outrage? Let us go!"

So intense was my shame that I could not at once answer. Regaining control of myself I said:

"There lies to the west of us a country which is the governing centre of a great Christian body, once the centre of a mighty empire of Christians, as it had been before an empire of heathens. From there is now governed a religious empire, a body of Christians, which is one of the largest and best organised in this world. I know not the country personally, for I know only my native land and that is far away beyond the seas; but I know that the people are not so bound in ignorance as those of Judea, at least those who rule. They are what we call civilised."

"And is it from this Christian empire that the petitions for Christian unity come?"

"No, Sire. The people are at unity among themselves, so far as Christian faith is concerned, save for those who believe not at all, though among these Christians are some who believe that rulers of this Church of God should not rule in temporal matters also as they have done in the past, whereby both Church and State have become corrupt, as do the governments of the earth if left unpurified for any great length of time. The inhabitants are of one race. As Christians they are not disturbed by such disagreements as trouble us in the land from which I come, the inhabitants of which are a composite race, united but made up of people from every nation under heaven, the best of which survive; they and their offspring forming a new type of such excellence that the new race will in time absorb everything into itself. But in Christian faith, from this mixing of all ingredients, we have chaos. It is from this region, my home, that these prayers for relief from intolerable conditions have largely come and also in part from some older nations which see our difficulties, though they are

not themselves so vitally affected in their Christian life."

"But about this nearer great Christian empire. Are they indeed Christians such as the Master left upon earth?"

"Christians they are in belief, though many things have been added to it since the Master's time. Would it not be better for you yourself, Sire, to visit them, as it is not for me to criticise."

"Well spoken, Mortal." The interruption came from Charity, who had been an attentive listener.

"These people," I continued, "are Christian as a nation. For many years their government was the government of the secular empire and of the Christian Church as well, though the Master Himself said that His kingdom was not of this world. There, religion was in connection with the government."

"Religion in connection with the government? And how could it be otherwise?"

"It is not so in the land from which I come."

"Then your people are a Godless people?"

"Not so. Though many among us are Godless. But in many lands there have crept into the Church of God many evils, solely by mixing secular government with spiritual affairs."

"Incredible. Then in your land your rulers recognise no God?"

"In theory, yes, but on account of the numberless differences of opinion as to who God is and what is His will, and on account of the presence of many who really at heart believe not that there is a God, we who elect our own rulers are, as a nation, afraid to put God or the Church of God officially at the head of the government; and yet in practice, in the management of our affairs, we are not a Godless people."

"Incredible. How can such things be? It would be supposed that you as Christians and having the choice of

rulers, would first require that your rulers should be Christians."

"Then perhaps those we might prefer would not be made rulers, as the enemies of Christ are active."

"And His friends are not?"

"Not as active as they should be."

"What a world! Would we were away from it, were it the Master's will! What good can we do here? But it is the Master's will that we remain. That is enough. But tell me again and more in detail about these nearer people, these who at least recognise Christ officially and are at unity among themselves."

"They are at unity among themselves, at least to outward appearance, but not with others. They are themselves the fraction of a rupture brought about in a greater Christian Church by a quarrel over but two words in the statement of their belief.[1] Neither side would yield. Men thought their own opinions of more importance than the will of God. The result was one of the greatest schisms ever known in the Christian Church, one portion going one way, the other portion another. The two fragments are now numerically the largest Christian bodies on the earth but agree not together. Before the schism the united Church had been officially connected with a mighty secular empire which ruled the earth. It had become Christian when the faith in Christ spread mightily. The schism has retarded growth and much of value is wasted between the warring elements. As I now see it, men, left to their own devices, had driven away Peace and had not Charity."

"And the pity that this great schism was over trifles."

"Nominally over trifles. These trifles they claimed were

[1] "But the chief and most abiding point of dogmatic difference consisted in the doctrine of the twofold procession of the Holy Ghost and the interpolation in the ancient creed of the church of the words *Filioque* ('and from the Son?')."—*Chambers's Encyclopædia.* London and Edinburgh, William and Robert Chambers, Ltd.; Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Co. Article "Greek Church."

important as representative of vital truth. But back of such nominal differences were deeper ones, political and national, in which selfish interests were at stake. Precedence, who should be the greater, who should be the first in the kingdom of heaven and the making and rejection of certain peremptory demands, were factors."

"And which of these two great fragments of a church is it that we are now to seek?"

"The one to the west of us, the one that to-day owes its strength largely to the fact that after the schism it was affiliated with the most powerful of the then nations of the earth."

"And the other?"

"The other is still a mighty church. It may be called the older. It perhaps does not, to the same extent as its fellow church, seek to usurp rulership from others and is, in doctrine and customs, nearer to those of Christ. In public worship a large portion of its membership uses to-day the human language of Christ Himself.[1]

"And is the older Church not so important as the other?"

"To my mind more so, Sire."

"Why not then lead us at first to where this body of Christians may reside? Are they great in numbers?"

"They are, though now, locally subdivided among themselves into at least three great national churches, independent of each other, made up of the inhabitants of widely distant regions.[2] As a whole we call it the Eastern Church.

[1] This statement is only partially correct. Christ is supposed to have used, colloquially, the Palestinian Aramaic dialect, at least in early life; later, when His work was more extended, the Greek tongue. As to the present use of Greek in the Eastern Church, the portion of that Church which is contained in the Russian Church uses in its liturgical services neither ancient nor modern Greek but a Slavonic dialect, originally adopted because it would be intelligible to the people, but now as unknown to them as the Latin tongue to the masses of the Latin communion.

[2] The Russian Church, the Church in Greece, and the Church within the Turkish dominions.

I, however, think you should first seek the Western or the church we call Roman, as historically it is more directly connected with many of us who have asked your help than is the modern Eastern church, with which as yet we have comparatively little to do. It will help you to understand our troubles if you will first investigate this Roman Church whose claims we cannot possibly allow. It claims to be the one and only true Church of Christ, and glories in its unity of which you should learn in detail."

"And you claim that this Church has not unity?"

"There can be no doubt that so far as its own membership is concerned, which exists in many lands throughout the entire world, it has the most complete unity existing in any Christian Church. That Church to-day surpasses all others in unity in doctrine, unity in public worship, and unity in government. In obedience to its own authorities and in organisation it excels all others, but the unity is internal and it has been gained by worldly methods and through preposterous claims. The unity is the forcible cohesion of a homogeneous mass and this mass is not at unity with whatever may oppose it. Its claims for precedence have set it against all other bodies, not only its opponents in the original schism. It claims to be not only the true Church but the oldest, the best. This Church is UNITY, it claims. Let those who desire unity come to it, submit to its authority uninquiringly, believe as it does in everything, for what it believes must be the truth. This we cannot all bring ourselves to do, for we think that such unity is so obtained by allowing no one to differ, and it is maintained more to preserve an aggressive organisation than for the love of Christ. This motive, we believe, is largely what governs the actions of its ruling authorities who have the lust of power, though it has faithful workers, working for Christ alone."

"And the two great factions, Roman and Eastern, is it the wish of both of them to remain divided?"

"It is, Sire. That is my belief, at least. The more

easterly people make no effort, though not necessarily opposing greater union with others. The powerful western people oppose union with all outsiders except by absorption on their part and for this they continually strive. They have no charity for any who are not their own."

"Nor have any charity for them. Is it not so?"

"It is true, but how else can we resist what we feel to be an injustice, a chafing insult? But these people in their home, as we shall see them, as well as their Eastern opponents, feel not so much the need of this unity. They are in their native countries among themselves only and virtually in national churches. They feel not the hindrances of differences as we do in my native land where we have no national church. With us, as stated, men have congregated from every nation under heaven, each with his individual belief, the faith of his fathers, his national church, his human characteristics, his intolerance of all but that pertaining to his own, and a bigotry coming usually from ignorance, as he has no knowledge of anything but his own."

"Where is this land of yours? May it not need our services more than others?"

"It is true, Sire, it does. But it is far away. Nearer lie these others, which it might assist us first to visit as our way may lead."

"Then, Mortal, direct our faithful guide, our Peace, how you would have us proceed."

It was when the leader had first commanded that we leave the disappointing land of Judea that Peace instinctively led the way in the direction I had indicated, all following; our discourse as here set down continuing meanwhile. When at last I was particularly directed to show Peace the way, we had already passed within the bounds of the land we sought, and in the distance, flashing in the sun, appeared the buildings of an extensive city, beautiful in design and interspersed with growth of green, the whole undulating in hills and dales in wave-like formation.

"What fair city is this?" asked the leader.

"The one we seek, Sire. The Eternal City; so called by one of its own poets of bygone ages. And so it would seem to be, at least as much so as any earthly thing can, for it has existed in some form for as long a time as can be accounted for in the memory of man."

"And to this city came the Master?"

"No, but some of His first followers did, and here did mighty work for Him."

"And do His followers here do likewise now?"

"In their own way, yes."

"Let us speak with some of them."

While nearing the city we had seen a most prominent building, approaching which we met with a man of modest and devout mien, in sombre dress and whose path lay as did ours, towards the edifice. Accosting him directly our leader asked:

"Whither go you, Mortal?"

"To yonder temple to worship as directed by our Holy Church."

"To worship whom?"

"Who else but Christ in this Christian land?"

"This land is Christian then?"

"So I thought when I came here. I am from afar, a servant of the Master in other lands but obedient to my superiors in this His Church on earth, in this its governing city. At home I find much to do for Him, the Master. I have no other occupation. It is my religion. But here it seems religion is wanting. Here I meet many of my fellows from other lands and from this. They talk not of the Master's work,—of how much they do or hope to do for Him. Their talk is of forms and ceremonies, of worldly gain, of how to secure preferment over others, of this man or that man, Church dignitaries, and of which is likely to be the greater, of who shall rule, and of how to obtain money to aggrandise the Church."

"You have a head, a leader here?"

"We have, but I have not seen him. He is too great for me, a poor humble servant of the Church among thousands of others."

"Would he not speak to you?"

"He would had I reason to ask it. I am under my immediate superiors whose business it is, under our rules, to confer for me with our Churchly head. I am, as I said, a stranger. Here comes one who may better enlighten you."

The one referred to was an individual in similar dress but dissimilar in all else to the one with whom our leader had been speaking. He was aggressive in manner and seemingly without humility. To him our Leader said:

"What information can you give as to these Christians? Are they at unity, and if not, do they desire it?"

"Christians? Here? We are all Catholics. Who is it asks? A Jew?"

"Not a Jew, my mortal friend, nor yet a Christian as you understand the term, nor what you call a Catholic. We are servants of the Christ from other worlds. Whose servant are you?"

"The servant of our Holy Church. But I may not speak for her. It is not allowed. We speak only as we are directed by our higher authorities. To them you should go."

"And where shall we find them?"

"The way you are now going. In yonder building they are to be found more readily than elsewhere."

"And can you speak to them for us and say we wish speech with them?"

"You will need greater influence than mine to secure such favour."

"Such influence we have already," said our leader and we passed on.

It will be remembered that among the powers given to these heavenly messengers for the prosecution of this inquiry were: omnipresence, ability to compel witnesses to appear and also at command to cause them to reveal their most secret thoughts. At once, I know not how, we were

as if in session in some room in the sacred edifice and by the exercise of these powers there was before us, as a witness and under examination, a personage of importance, clad for the most part as had been those who had met us, but the garments were of much more brilliant hue.

"You are the head of this organisation called the Catholic Church?" was the first inquiry of which I was conscious.

"God forbid that I should claim that honour unelected, or even wish for it, though it is one much to be desired and I confess to such ambition. I am called its governing spirit."

"It is the Church of Christ that you represent?"

"His one only and universal church throughout the world, not national, but claiming the whole world for its membership, among every nation, in every clime. Its head is the vicegerent of Christ Himself and the head of all other churches and their heads throughout the world."

"Did Christ give him this authority?"

"So we claim and our Church was founded directly by the greatest of His first followers."

"And not by Christ Himself? And who is greatest among Christ's followers?"

"I state only what our Church states and through it only may salvation be obtained."

"Are no others, then, Christians?"

"Not according to our belief. They may be Christians and not belong to the external body of the Church, but if really Christians they are in a state of grace, and, in fact, belong to the internal spirit of the universal Church, which only we are, and, dying in which, they are saved. We are the only true Church."

"And you are at unity and differ not with any?"

"Those amongst us who at times have differed have left us. We go on the same forever. Should they desire the unity we have, let them return."

"Then all churches that do not acknowledge yours as head were originally portions of your Church?"

"I cannot truthfully say so. You would find otherwise. Some have left us. Some were parts of one early Church on the earth when all were alike. As time went on they would not acknowledge the headship of Christ's vicegerent on earth, our ruler."

"Was that not because that headship was self-made and self-maintained, was first owing to a prominence due to partnership with a powerful secular government and because other heads, as such, would have had as much right to be the superior head on earth if one were necessary? Did not these others refuse to say that one among them should be the greatest and refuse submission to him as such?" The inquiry was as if prompted by some one familiar with earthly affairs.

"Our head is at least the head over our Church and that is honour enough, for we are great. Let the other questions pass. They are unimportant to us."

"But not to others, perhaps. Then you are not at unity with all?"

Without reply the churchman took his departure and he was allowed to do so unchallenged. In his place appeared a handsome figure of commanding presence, in similar dress but of somewhat less brilliant hue, a man with kindly and cheerful face. He addressed our leader with the title of respect which we used as if he had been listening to the proceedings and had noted our method. His eagerness to testify seemed an effort to overcome the effects of what had looked like embarrassment in the former witness and in some measure to apologise for him, so creating a better impression for his testimony.

"Sire, I am a faithful servant of this Holy Church but in another land where better conditions, as we think, govern. I am not superior to him who has just spoken, but from my environment I see things differently. He has never been far from home and knows not personally the conditions elsewhere. My home is far away."

"I know him, Sire," I interrupted. "He is from my

country though I have never spoken with him. His face is familiar with us and his deeds are for good."

"I would wish to say," continued this witness, "that our Church with us is purified of many drawbacks which hinder it here. I can to you, speak more plainly than I would to one of my own communion, for I should not wish to unsettle his faith, I who can speak as by authority. Here our Church is hindered by what we call Politics. There we have more of what may be called Religion. The present head of our Church is of our kind, a man for good. It is my firm belief that at some time this great Church of ours will be ruled throughout the earth from that broad land afar, my home. There better surroundings give better chance for the cultivation of ideals. There errors, which we have undoubtedly made, will more easily be corrected and by ourselves, within ourselves. With us will dwell our spiritual head and we shall rule, not the secular government but our own people spiritually, as the nation of which we shall be a part shall rule the secular world. With us, as churchmen in that land, will dwell the membership of other Christian churches as great as ours, and if our quiet demeanour and progress do not tempt them to join us—I cannot believe they will ever do so—we shall at least show such forbearance as will command their respect. Together we shall dwell in peace though differing."

I happened to glance at Peace while the witness thus spoke and could not but notice the look of intense interest and the smile of happiness which shone on his countenance.

The leader also showed approval and said:

"Good Brother, for goodness is shown by your words, we would hear more from you but in your own country, for we are sure that our inquiry should not be conducted here, as from here come not the petitions we are sent to answer."

"May it please your most illustrious Excellency," said a gruff but not unfriendly voice, "to give hearing here to one who represents a great branch of the Christian

Church and one whose greatest organisation is near at hand, but which differs entirely with those officially represented in this country, and one which protests entirely and forever against the doctrines here believed and taught, against the system of Church government here practised, and against the human errors which have crept into and are now maintained by this body of so-called Christians, which they are only because they do indeed believe in Christ, but practise not the virtues which He inculcated."

The voice came from one who must also have been a listener, an elderly person, of robust build, whose dress was not the ecclesiastical uniform of those who had been testifying, though differing somewhat from the dress of an ordinary citizen. He spoke as if by authority as an official of his Church.

"We would know," said our leader, "from whence you come and whom you represent."

"Our ancestors were, at one time, officials and members of this so-called Holy Catholic Church but could not admit that all the human errors and additions to its belief and practice which had crept into it, which fostered the ambitions of those in authority and made for their wealth and the wealth and earthly power of the Church, should be binding on all as the will of God. We protested as members within the Church and would have purified it. This, those who had the rule over us, prevented. Some, who thought with us, submitted to authority and remained within the Church, thinking that as it was of Divine authority, it was their duty to do so and more particularly that they might in time, if possible, reform it from within. We threw off this authority and separated, that we might have freedom of conscience and worship God without the compulsion of man-made rules. We have founded a great church which is now independent of all such restraint as those who live here feel."

"And this you did by Divine command?"

"As we believe. We are still a part of the Christian

Church which Christ founded. What we did was done by men under, as we believe, Divine guidance."

"And you are recognised as a part of the Christian Church by the Church from which you came?"

"Oh, no! To them we are Anathema, Outcast of Outcasts, Heretic of Heretics. We are under ban by their authorities. To them heathens, who believe not at all, are more welcome than are we."

"And you do not desire reunion with this your mother Church from which you separated?"

"God forbid! After all our years of warfare to be free from her dominion? Think of the lives it has cost us and money."

"Lives and money? For disunion? Then from you come none of the prayers for unity. Your Church then is a new church, man-made, dating no nearer to Christ than the time when you separated."

"Save through the Church through which we came."

"And with which you are now at variance. Are there any of your belief in this distant land from which came the brother who preceded you?"

"Many and many, your Excellency."

"Then we will hear them there, as he shall be heard. We must go first to those to whom we are sent, not to you who ask not for us and are content to remain as you are."

Before, however, the order could be given to depart another appeared who asked to be heard, an elderly man of genial and scholarly appearance, in dress not unlike his predecessor. He said:

"On your way to this more distant country lies that of my birth, in which is established a Christian Church as old as that of this land in which you now sojourn, a Christian Church as continuous from Christ Himself and at one time likewise in grievous error but which we reformed from within by staying in it, casting out error as it appeared to us, and we are still striving to do so."

"And you are also at enmity with this Church of this land?"

"Not at enmity but distinct and separate as of different nations but ready at all times to listen to anything tending to any greater unity which may be accomplished without loss of our national heritage."

"When did you separate from it?"

"We separated not at all. Christ's messengers went into all lands and found followers, mine with others. The Church sprang up in all alike in each land, locally adapted and with its local superiors. In time, those of this land, as part of a powerful organisation, claimed precedence and insisted that all should recognise their head as our head and as head over all. This we would not do, though certain of our secular rulers, for earthly and monetary gain, gave order that it should be done and took measures accordingly. Their action was and always has been repudiated by our spiritual rulers. Our Church comes from the same early Church as they do direct, and the two are as aged, the one as the other."

"Then came all your troubles over the question of who should be greatest. And from your land come these prayers for unity?"

"In part, yes."

"For unity with this Christian Church here?"

"Not so much for that as for unity among ourselves. This Church here troubles us not so much, though they have representatives among us. With them as representatives of what is to us a foreign churchly power, even though they may be native born, we have no particular grievance, except that some few of us have fear that they aim for wealth and secular power, as in times past, to rule over us and to coerce us in churchly matters, to think as they think and to acknowledge their foreign ecclesiastical ruler as our supreme head. To most of us, however, this is vanity. We have, to a large extent, charity for all, to permit them to believe and act as they may think best,

they in their way, we in ours. It is among ourselves as a nation that we have not unity. It is the boast of our Church that in doctrine and practice we are so broad minded that those of all shades of belief and practice in it may dwell together in unity. But some there are among us that have not this charity. Not only those openly separated but those nominally of us disagree. Some of us are sticklers for trifles, for forms or for the absence of forms, for mere words, and to such extent that union with strangers would be preferred to unity with those of their own family in the faith, a disunion with brethren being preferred to living together in unity if differing. Then we have fragments, separations, caused by dissensions amongst us, and these fragments made up of those who were once a part of our ancient church and who should be with us yet. One great body there is, formerly of us, of necessity a modern man-made body, but made so by our persecution and intolerance. At that time our Church was torpid, asleep. The times were of that character. We did nothing nor asked that anything should be done. Then some earnest men among us tried to waken us. We would not be wakened. They strove to liven us as members of our own Church, working from within. Men were worldly and took but little interest in things religious. We ourselves cast out these earnest men and would have none of them. By necessity they set up their own churchly organisation. In time our Church awoke. Those who were separated accomplished their end by leaving us, but to our great loss and theirs. We would they were of us now and we of them."

"Then from you and them come these prayers for unity?"

"To but a limited extent. Those differing are prosperous as are we and we are satisfied. We clash but not unbearably. Their descendants and ours, with those from many lands, have gone to this more distant country of which you have been told, where a greater number of discordant elements are pressed together and will not unite. There

relief is imperative. Heal them in that our sister land and from us, when the results are seen, will come up as many prayers as from them. Their necessity is the greater."

"Then it is our will that to them we go at once," said the leader. "There we may hear you or your representatives more at length if you so desire. To you in your own land we may give attention later if necessary. Where is our faithful guide? Peace, direct us."

Peace, turning, that I might indicate to him the proper direction, again headed the celestial party which sped over land and sea toward the destination in what, so far as men such as ourselves are concerned, is called the newer portion of the world.

EPSILON

The Inquiry Begins

AS to how we came, when we arrived, or just where, are not of record nor are they important. It is to be noted, however, that in passing we saw from afar a great city, the world's metropolis, concerning which in reply to our leader's inquiry, I furnished the information that it was the home of him who had last testified, and to the effect that his Church, there existent, was not at unity with itself but desired it, though not fervently, for the Church and land were at peace, prosperous, and well satisfied.

On arriving at our destination, sessions were at once held in a vast building that I could not place, one apparently remodelled for the purpose, or so changed in appearance by the mighty throng of people that filled it, as to be unrecognisable. Looking towards the body of the auditorium from the front, where sat the members of this august commission, nothing could be seen but humanity, tier on tier, the mass of heads stretching away in the vast arena to an indistinct distance. How could such a number have been brought together? Was there some form of advertisement? How did the knowledge get about that such a commission was in the land and about to make this inquiry? Was there divine or supernatural influence? Who could tell. At least it showed a widespread and intense interest in the subject. Here were congregated great numbers of those who wished to be heard in person

or by their representatives and also thousands who sat in patience with no other purpose than to hear everything that was said in relation to an all-absorbing topic as one of vital importance.

Facing this mighty gathering, as if in judicial state, awe-inspiring yet not repellent, sat those supernatural beings, the representatives of the great Master, in whom dignity was not wanting, but who sat, not as judges, to inquire into man's misdeeds, but as genial and interested self-invited guests, easily reachable by humanity and easily to be influenced by human pleas. They gave the impression of being fellows with men, wishing to help in every way and to satisfy those who might appear before them. He who had been the leader, as presiding officer, sat centrally, supported on either side as able assistants, by Peace and Charity. Farther apart and on either side sat as recorders the angels Bonum and Malum, who, as it was to be noticed later, took down testimony or noted its salient points, with the peculiarity that both wrote not simultaneously, either one or the other registering what seemed most suitable to his peculiar record. As for myself, I was provided with suitable accommodations, so that all that occurred might by me be put into writing, not officially but as a man would, in such popular form that those not present of my fellow men might have the benefit of the proceedings as here set down. The scene was not unlike many in which I had figured in the same capacity in bygone years, and my occupation was not unlike that by which I had gained my daily bread before I had forsaken it to undertake the Master's work.

On this occasion I not only filled the place of one who outlines reports of proceedings for the benefit of others, but, by reason of my peculiar position, as a mortal directly called to this particular work, I filled an intermediate place between mortal and celestial, conveying the wishes of the one and the requirements of the other. Through my intercession witnesses were allowed a hearing and through me

were conveyed to those witnesses the methods of procedure required and the use of suitable forms of speech such as we had used on our earthward journey when addressing the Divine representative. A noticeable difference from ordinary procedure was that there were no professional people as counsellors in charge of the interests of those who wished to be heard. Every one spoke directly, without intermediary, their personal interest and earnest desires being the only reasons given or accepted for a courteous and exhaustive hearing.

He who had been charged with the conduct of this inquiry, as presiding officer, began the proceedings with a concise statement:

"We have been sent to you, O Mortals, by the command of our Master and yours, in answer to your petitions—and I am sure that from you, all of you, they have come, or you would not be here present before us—to learn what it is that troubles you and how, and, if possible, to show you how those troubles may be avoided. We know that you as Christians are not as one, that differences exist. Have you any to tell what these differences are, how they came to exist, and what evil results come from them? Later we would hear from those of differing opinions that we may know how these differences look from different points of view."

A remarkable person, evidently of the clergy of some communion of Christians, stepped forward. He was at once placed prominently where his testimony could be heard not only by the members of the commission but by every one present.

"I am, most Worshipful Sire——"

"Confine your worship to Him whom we serve," commanded the Moderator. "We are not God, though sent by Him. In our person as His representative, respect is due, but we wish to be considered more as an elder brother, desiring but your welfare."

"Then, Sire," continued the witness——

"First, what is your name?" interrupted the Celestial Moderator.

"My name is unimportant, for I am but the representative, as its elected head, of an organisation comprising deputies of many Christian bodies. We wish for unity, for brotherly kindness, for charity among all Christians. It was largely at our suggestion and through our agency that the petitions which have brought you here have been sent regularly, although those sending them themselves fully desire what they ask. Through our encouragement there has been co-operation in asking to show that in such wishes at least there is unity. We are overwhelmed with thankfulness that our prayers have been answered to such extent that you have been sent, and that an inquiry is to be made. If your suggestions direct and aid our efforts, they may be more successful, and we realise that it is only by making such efforts that we may hope for more direct assistance. In this, our favoured land, we as Christ's followers meet with strange difficulties. This land has been a haven for all peoples on the earth, Christian and Pagan, a refuge from oppression, a friend for all in distress, and an almoner for those in poverty. Here they have come and here, with their descendants, they abide. One cause of our differences is this presence among us, in one place, of so many Christians who are of all shades of belief and who come from different national churches which have differed through local adaptations and national characteristics. All this is of little moment when these several peoples are in their original birthplace homes, where all in one locality are of one way of thinking. But gathered here as fellow citizens, all mingle and fraternise, with the result that on religious questions, in which one thinks not as another, there is friction. By close association one is influenced by another and it matters not in which direction. Members of a body with strict principles are liberalised by contact with members of another body which is not so strict, or the opposite takes place, both

resulting in serious differences. Influences are brought to bear on members of Christian bodies by those not Christian, for we have anti-Christians, Infidels, Pagans, Jews, Mohammedans, and followers of other false prophets. Controversies arise, then come divisions,—over belief, over how bodies should be carried on and governed, over what penalties should be inflicted on those who obey not the regulations of the particular body to which they may belong, or over questions as to what is right and what is wrong, questions largely governed by birth, parental training, secular education, prejudice, individual inclination and fashion, and about which opinions vary from time to time. What may seem wrong to men in one age may to them seem right in another. Then, too, there are controversies through personal considerations, those of leaders concerning precedence or by reason of their vanity, or over the results of their human thought and research; the personal friends of such an one upholding him against those who are not friendly or who dislike him. From all of these causes disagreements in thought and practice occur, and divisions, when the fragments fly apart without effort, while reconciliation and unity require superhuman exertion. In all of these ways have come lasting schism, the causes of which in many instances no longer exist."

"This is work for you, good Peace, and you, good Charity," said the Celestial Moderator to those with him.

"It is sad," said Charity.

"An enemy, War and his spirit, has done this," said Peace.

"It is indeed sad," continued the witness, "but the more sad it is to think that it is all but the exposition of what human nature has been from the beginning. When humanity is not governed by a monarch, a majority of those governed, rule. When our churches are governed by God's will they are monarchies. Some of our brethren claim for their ecclesiastical rulers monarchial powers in the Church. With us here, officially, the Church as a whole is republican,

with the rule of the majority. A majority is always intolerant if thwarted. As long as all think alike there is harmony. But as soon as some one differs then the intolerance of the majority, or more properly those in power, for the majority gives the power, is shown. The early Jews were intolerant of idolaters, the later Jews of Christ and His teachings, though He Himself was a Jew and one without guile. In later ages Christ's followers were massacred in cold blood by wholesale because they followed not the rule of the majority, and those who did such deeds thought they did God's service and gave thanks to God for the opportunity. Then came to this our land many who fled from such religious persecution elsewhere. In some one section congregated those of one way of thinking until they were in the ascendency, when persecutions as intolerant were inaugurated against fellow Christians who differed.

"The rule of the majority, with our religious people here, works as it does in secular matters where power gives right. The minority are kept from rule and given no rights. Dissatisfaction ensues and dissension. When from such cause this happens in the Church, there is another schism, and another sect or fragment is cut off.

"With us, too, familiarity with these dissensions breeds contempt of them. Their injurious effects are minimised in men's opinions. Our efforts to heal them meet with little encouragement because of the indifference due to this minimisation.

"At times our efforts for unity meet with active opposition, partly from interested motives, partly from the best of reasons, a desire for purity. The argument then is, that evil should be cast out of the Church, even at the expense of unity. Dissension is of less importance than that the Church itself, or at least a portion of it, should not be pure. Better be separated than corrupt.

"Then again certain of us believe and teach that dissension is not an evil but governs as do the laws of trade and barter, which argument affects us readily as we are

a trading nation. These say that competition is the life of trade and that on emulation and rivalry depend the life of the Christian Church. Competition may be the life of trade but it is the death of Christian fellowship as it is the end of good feeling in trade. Among Christians it fosters envy, strife, and bitterness. It aims not to spread but to change belief, to augment numbers under one banner by gaining those serving the same cause under another. It looks for man's faults not his virtues. From it come all uncharitableness and fault-finding.

"You ask as to the extent of these differences.

"Disunion is everywhere. Even among those not Christian there is division. Jews are divided into opposing bodies. The believers in Mohammed have bodies of true believers and those who are not so. Christians but follow the fashion. We have with us representatives of all the great national churches of Christians throughout the world, which are the older bodies; in our human nomenclature Oriental, Greek, Russian, Roman, British; and of bodies that have come from the older ones as the German Church, a great national body, or the Scandinavian; and we have also the subdivisions of all of them. In this land these fragments are manifold. So called Catholics have diversity. Among those called Protestant, who have at different times protested against the errors and pretensions of the Church of Rome, we have the most endless variety. We have Lutherans in sixteen kinds, Presbyterians in twelve kinds, Baptists in thirteen kinds, Methodists in seventeen kinds; in all some one hundred and forty-three so-called denominations, to say nothing of at least one hundred and fifty varieties of congregations which have no denominational connection.[1] Among such diversity can we ever have unity? Can all these many and diverse elements ever be melted into one?"[2]

[1] Estimated by H. K. Carroll from the Census of 1890.

[2] The first impression one gets in studying the results of the census is that there is an infinite variety of religions in the United States. There

The Celestial Moderator made a gesture of impatience. Addressing the witness he said:

"To you all this should be horrible to contemplate. Horrible! What do you do personally and your organisation, to better these conditions?"

"What can we do? We are helpless; a few against many. Many, and the most of that many through indifference only, are against the few who desire a change. We have asked help and are in your hands. Show us the way and we will try to walk in it.

"You ask as to the evil effects of these conditions. They are numberless. First and foremost is the waste, the waste of time, effort, and money. We duplicate our efforts on the same objects; and the results, by reason of this division, are

---

are churches small and churches great, churches white and churches black, churches high and low, Orthodox and Heterodox, Christian and Pagan, Catholic and Protestant, Liberal and Conservative, Calvinistic and Armenian, native and foreign, Trinitarian and Unitarian. All phases of thought are represented by them, all possible theologies, all varieties of polity, ritual, usage, forms of worship. . . . Nowhere have denominational families developed as in the United States. In no quarter of the globe have the Lutherans or the Methodists, the Presbyterians or the Baptists, the Friends or the Mennonites, separated into so many branches as here in this land of perfect civil and religious liberty. . . . No denomination has thus far proved to be too small for division. Denominations appear with as few as twenty-five members. I was reluctantly compelled to exclude from the census one with twenty-one members. . . .

No worse puzzle was ever invented than that which the names of the various denominations present.

We have for example, the "Presbyterian Church in the United States" and the "Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;" the "Reformed Church in the United States" and the "Reformed Church in America. . . ."

Among the Presbyterians there are four bodies of the Reformed variety. I have always had great difficulty in distinguishing between them. One is called the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, another the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America. One has a synod and the other a general synod. But it is not always easy to remember which has the synod and which the general synod. I have found in their monthly organs a more sure

meagre. We strive among ourselves and fight against our own people. One holds back the other and both are impotent. Our weakness, particularly from such a cause which is so self-evident, and seemingly so easily removable at our own pleasure, is the scorn of those not of us. Through jealousy, or that no insignificant difference of opinion may be misrepresented, we build buildings for our worshippers where there are already a sufficient number."

"You build more buildings for the worship of Christ than are needed?"

"Not than would be needed if all the inhabitants would make use of them. In that case the number would not suffice."

"In this, your native land?"

---

method of distinction. One of these organs has a blue cover and the other a pink cover. . . .

About a century ago a number of ministers and churches seceded from the Kirk in Scotland and organised the Secession Church. Soon after half of this Secession Church seceded from the other half, and in process of time the halves were quartered. Then, as a matter of course there was a dispute among them as to who were the first seceders. Those who thought their claim best, prefixed the word "Original" to their title and became Original Seceders. Then there was a union of Seceders and Original Seceders, and the result was the United Original Secession Church, or, more properly, the Church of the United Original Seceders. This is probably the only instance in which the ideas of division and union are both incorporated in one title. . . .

There are twelve bodies of Presbyterians to be distinguished, and seventeen bodies of Methodists; and Methodist titles are scarcely more helpful than Presbyterian. We have Methodist Episcopal, which we recognise as the parent body, and which we sometimes distinguish as the Northern Church, though it covers the South as well as the North. We have the Methodist Episcopal, South, which resulted from the division in 1844. We have the African Methodist Episcopal, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion, the Coloured Methodist Episcopal, the Union American Methodist Episcopal, the African Union Methodist Protestant, the Zion Union Apostolic, and the Evangelist Missionary,—all coloured bodies. We have also three bodies of Congregational Methodists, none of which are congregational in fact, with Free, Independent, Protestant, Primitive, and other varieties of Methodists. . . .

"More particularly, yes, but elsewhere also."

"How many Christians make this land their home?"

"But about one-third of all who dwell here, which third includes all classes of Christians who are apart from one another, as for instance those who follow the Roman belief and those of all kinds who protest against it, with those others not Protestant but belonging to historical and national churches like those of England and the East."

"And in the world at large, how do the Christians number?"

"In about the same proportion. Of all who inhabit the earth one-third is of a non-Christian belief called Buddhist, the followers of a man of bygone age. One-third more comprise Brahmins, Pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews,

---

Of Baptist bodies we count thirteen, including the Regular, North, South, and Coloured; the Freewill in two varieties; the General, Separate, United, Six-Principle, Seventh Day, Primitive, and the Old Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestination; also the Baptist Church of Christ, which claims to have descended direct from the Apostles. . . .

There are four bodies of Brethren who object to any other designation. They are popularly known as (Plymouth) Brethren. By putting the word Plymouth in parenthesis we can distinguish them from other bodies of Brethren; but how shall we distinguish each of these four bodies of (Plymouth) Brethren from the other three? . . .

Much confusion often arises from the similarity of titles. There are several bodies called the Church of God with only a slight variation in two instances. There are the Church of God and Churches of God in Christ Jesus, both Adventists; the Church of God, otherwise distinguished as the denomination founded by Elder Winebrenner, and the Church of God in Christ. The large body which appears in the list as Disciples of Christ, also often calls itself simply "The Christians." There is another denomination, with similar tenets and two branches, which uses the same designation, and is otherwise known as the Christian Connection. . . . A few years ago the Disciples were popularly distinguished as the body to which President Garfield belonged, and they are probably better known as Campbellites, a term which is offensive to them, than by either of their accepted titles.—From Introduction to *The Religious Forces of the United States*, by H. J. Carroll, in charge of the division of churches. Eleventh Census (1890). Revised to 1896. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

also non-Christians; in all two-thirds. The remaining one-third is Christian and that third in the world at large is composed of two-thirds of those belonging to the early Christian churches of history and one-third of those called Protestant, who came from and protest against one of those early churches, that of Rome."

"And such a little world as seen from without to be so divided! It must be a crowded world."

"In some portions it is, in other portions it is not. With us, in this so called newer land, there is plenty of room. On our Northern continent, in terms in which we express area, there is but one man to every eleven square miles of territory. Elsewhere it is more congested. But if I were to take you to some structure sufficiently high from which you could see to the distance we call nine miles in each direction, a minutest fraction of the earth's dimensions and a distance which is by no means too great for a human eye to include, and all those who live on the entire earth should be gathered together around that structure, it would be possible to see them all, nor would they be crowded. Each one would have room for motion."

"And for the Christians of this earth, this earth for all the people on which Christ died, how much room would be required?"

"An area about one-third as large would contain them all and no very great elevation would be necessary. The inhabitants of this land are but about one-twentieth of those inhabiting the entire world. Our Christians are but one-third of this number. Four square miles or what would be contained in a circle with a radius of slightly more than one mile would hold them all, if each had but enough room to stand comfortably. With sufficient room for living, one great city of necessity could maintain them all in comparative comfort."

"And to think that this small number cannot agree."

"Were we as Christians to try to live together in such close proximity it would but accentuate our differences."

"And but a small fraction of this small number desire unity?"

"Alas, yes. It is the desire of but a faithful few."

"If faithful then fear not. The desires of but one faithful follower of the Master are worthy of his consideration. If it is His will we are content. But tell us further as to the nature of these hindrances and the results of this lamentable condition."

The witness was about to continue as directed when he was interrupted by a voice from the audience.

"I think I can tell you, Commander, in but few words, what our trouble is."

The eyes of all were turned in the direction from which the voice came, where the standing figure of a person of military bearing was seen. The witness on the stand showed some irritation at the unauthorised interruption.

The voice of Peace was here heard, clear and decisive, but in tones suggestive rather than commanding, and as if speaking to himself alone:

"Perhaps the witness would like to hear what it is our friend would say. It may assist rather than hinder."

The kindly spirit in the words was at once communicated to the witness.

"By all means, Sire. Whatever will assist is preferable. I wish not to hinder. As you may direct.'

Turning to the interrupter the Moderator asked:

"Your name, Friend?"

"I am a warlike man and as such unnameable among Christians and yet should not Christians fight against wrong? I am no enemy of Peace. I would fight that Peace might prevail. I am no friend to discord. By not fighting there is strife. By fighting it may be put down and there is peace. By being prepared to fight the fight is avoided. I claim that as Christians our business is to fight. We are a church militant. The trouble is that we do not fight properly nor know we our enemies. We fight frequently

against ourselves or rebel against our officers. What way is that?

"Perhaps," said the Moderator, "with the kind permission of this our witness waiting here, you will suggest a better way."

"I would have the Church an army, and a successful one, able to do battle for the right when necessary and to maintain peace when it is not necessary to fight. Would you know why we as an army do not succeed? First, we are not organised properly and we have no commander whom all obey."

"You have Christ as your head, have you not?"

"We have, nominally at least, but He is not visibly on the ground in actual command. He is the Commander-in-Chief and we try to obey His orders as we understand them, when they reach us, but we have no Field-Marshal actually in life, with us, and of us, whom all acknowledge as head and through whom all orders should come."

"May it please your Eminence," said a voice, "we have such a head whom we call Holy Father. His orders are unquestionable. And we are thoroughly organised under subordinate commanders, with whom obedience to a superior is absolute, into regiments, battalions, and companies. Under such an organisation we work most effectively."

"Our friend speaks the truth," resumed the military witness, "and his organisation should be a model for all of us. But his commander is too low in rank. He is but a division commander, though his division is the most thoroughly organised and the most effective one in our army. We are not all of us in his division and under his orders. We need a general. This man's commander claims to be such and wishes to be so acknowledged. We do not all admit his claims because we claim that he has not been so appointed by the Commander-in-Chief. Meanwhile, in so far at least as the campaign in this country is concerned, where we are supposed to fight under one banner as Christians, we are in the position of an army whose

general has been killed with no succession arranged by military law, or whose commander-in-chief, the one directing the whole war everywhere, has never been on this particular field in person and has never delegated supreme authority to any one in particular."

"Meanwhile you cannot get along under direct orders from your Commander-in-Chief, who is able to direct you, no matter how great the distance?"

"I doubt not his powers, but we are human and have eyes and we want to see,—something visible and tangible. We have His messengers, His orderlies, and we can feel as it were, His own presence at times, but with us feeling is not as seeing.

"Our army without organisation, except as separate units, fights at random without a united front, or not knowing where to face—on which side is the enemy we are to meet. Our enemies are on all sides. We try to guard all sides at once. Our numbers, compared with those who are against us, make this impossible. There is but a minimum of effect with a maximum of effort. Our enemies are numerous because we fight both heathenism abroad and irreligion at home. In addition we duplicate our attacks,—send forces where not needed through misunderstanding of orders as to which particular regiment is to attend to a particular piece of work. In such a case both claim the right, which being disputed, the two fight against each other, until many on both sides, friends, not enemies, are killed, wounded, exhausted, or at least are terribly out of breath and so unable to fight, or until their resources are gone. Meanwhile the real enemy makes use of the advantage and captures a position from which he cannot be dislodged even when our best organised divisions are sent against it. It is not good sense nor economy, to say the least."

"That is the greater point," said another voice, "want of economy through duplication. Christians should all be organised into a trust for economical administration."

"Can our earthly friend inform us what a trust may be?" inquired the Moderator.

"It is a business term we have for a system of economical management. All interested put their goods into one general fund to be administered by trustees for the benefit of all. When well administered, by honest men, and as trustees, not for their own benefit only, it is the most economical system on earth. Such trustees do not send two men to do the work of one. They do not spend two of our money units where one is all that is necessary. Duplicates are sorted out and put where there is need or dispensed with altogether. If that is not advisable or possible they are kept in stock or storage for future use. Nothing, either goods, money, or effort, goes to waste."

"Would you tell us your name, my Friend?" asked the Moderator. "We are becoming confused by the number of those who will not assist us by conforming to that formality."

"I am called Magnate by my fellow men, a term honourable in itself but in our use given in ridicule, but still it denotes one who succeeds by the exercise of good business sense."

"Then, Magnate, having your name, we may call you again as needed, for no doubt your advice for the management of the Master's business on successful earthly lines will be of the greatest value."

Turning to the man of military mien, the Moderator asked his name also, that it might be recorded.

"You may call me Militant for I am engaged in warfare, both national and spiritual. By education I am fitted for the former, by conviction I engage in the latter, for I am persuaded that if ever this world is to be won for Christ, the rules of my profession must prevail."

"We would also hear your name," said the Moderator to him who had interrupted to present the claims of his connection to thorough organisation under central authority.

"The name that I prefer is Catholic, if you will allow it."

"Meaning a member of the whole undivided Church of Christ?"

"That is my claim."

"You shall have the title if you will prove your right to it."

"Others lay claim to the same designation unjustly, as I think I can prove. Meanwhile call me Romanus. It is a name of which any one may be proud."

"And you, my patient friend," said the Moderator, again addressing the witness on the stand whose testimony had been delayed by the interruptions of the others, "will you not gratify our wish to know your name? Without, how may we properly designate you in speech or on record, or call you at our need?"

"I may be called Representative for I am here not only for myself but as representing many whose wishes in this particular matter have been the cause of this inquiry."

"Then, Representative, we would have you proceed with your testimony, which you have so kindly allowed to be interrupted."

The witness resumed:

"I am reluctant, Sire, to draw your attention—you coming from the august Presence itself, and knowing us insignificant mortals to be but infinitesimal portions of God's creation—to most of the differences in opinion which separate Christ's followers here, which to you must seem so trivial, but which we think so important, and for which many of us, I have not the slightest doubt, would be willing, if necessary, to give our lives. I can only urge as our excuse that though they are microscopic from your point of view, they are to us, in proportion to our strength, matters of great moment. They are burdens grievous to be borne. To rid ourselves of them is a task almost beyond us, as to an ant would be the moving of a seed, small to us, but many times his size, and we know not how.[1]

[1] At a dinner table Mr. Huxley sat beside a lady who asked him whether he did not think it was a bad business that Rev. Mr. B. should

"It is historic fact that in the first four and one-half centuries after the Master came upon earth the Church made mighty strides. It was a united Church that won all the great victories of those early centuries and no great nation has been converted to Christ since the Church lost its unity. To our unhappy divisions, mostly of recent origin, we must attribute much of our weakness against the power of Satan. These divisions put us to shame before the world. They are a stumbling-block to many and through them countless souls are lost.[1] To-day, Christians throughout the world are not sufficiently united for great efforts.

"The commission of Christ's Church, as authorised by His command, is to convert the world, hence the work which we call missionary, as of one sent. In older days Christians understood that this was an imperative command which must be carried out at all hazards; if not by kindness, by force. From this idea came wars of conquest in heathen lands, often eventually for earthly gain and prosecuted at times with the greatest cruelty by loyal sons of the Church, yet originated and in a great part carried out with the

---

have adopted the eastward position in administering the sacrament. Mr. Huxley replied: "My dear lady, I am told by Sir John Herschel that to drop a bean at the end of every mile of a voyage to the nearest fixed star, would require a fleet of 10,000 ships, each of 600 tons burden, all starting full of beans. Now do you really think that the Maker of those fixed stars considers this new position of Mr. B.'s a serious matter?"

The scientist might have inquired further if the great God who sends the sun whirling through space is pleased to see us hurling anathemas at each other merely on matters of opinion. The God who holds Jupiter on his course likes to have the little folks given to him and if some prefer to be baptised when they are older, He may not object very much. The great God who hurries a comet through the planets does not mind if some folks have bishops. He only says: "See to it that they be good, and if you prefer presbyters, I will take them." But probably the God who never to our knowledge puts two planets where they will interfere with each other, who always provides them elbow-room, may not like two churches to be put where one would be better.

[1] From Circular of Church Unity Society, U. S. A.

express purpose of spreading the kingdom of the Prince of Peace.

"Indeed many of us cannot see beyond our own shores and think that anything in Christianity which is foreign to us and our ways of thought is necessarily unchristian. We have little knowledge of what has been done in the past by Christians elsewhere. We think that Christ came to save us, His elect, in what we call America, and care very little what becomes of older Christians in older lands.

"As an instance, we have with us to-day many direct descendants of one of the early historic churches, the one mentioned by him who gave his name as Romanus, a Church which in a more barbarous age carried the Gospel by force of arms into heathen lands. Those of us not of this faith are apt to consider those who are, not only as foreign but corrupt beyond redemption; Christian only in name and worse than heathen. For such we have no charity and we say that Christian lands dominated by them should be reclaimed from that allegiance as much as heathen lands from unbelief.

"Some centuries ago elsewhere, before we as a nation were in existence, a contest took place between Christians of this Church over human errors which had undoubtedly crept in. Those who would reform were persistent. Those who should have listened were intolerant and by earthly wisdom, retaining the power on their side, they expelled from the Church those who would so reform it. This rupture was by no wish of those active reforming spirits whose aim was to do good and who loved their Mother Church with all the love of which they were capable. It was never their wish, then or ever, that the schisms that they then necessarily made, should have been made, nor that they should continue. At any time they would have given their lives gladly to have done away with such disunion and be back in the Church from which they separated, if that Church could have been freed from the errors against which they had protested. Since then many of

these errors have been corrected within that Church, but the hard feelings engendered by the combat, the wars, the sufferings, the cruelties, and other inhumanities, have left such effects that those injured cannot find sufficient charity in their hearts to forgive and forget. Say they in excuse, the command is, 'As much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men, especially with them of the household of faith,' but that such forgiveness as this is not in human capacity.

"So it comes that in trying to Christianise the world we not only assume the great undertaking, greater than our ability, even if we worked to the best advantage, of Christianising the unbelieving world, but we add to that the task of wresting from Christian control lands and people already Christian, at least in name, arrogating to ourselves the authority to say who are Christians and who are not, a thing for God Himself to settle with Christ's followers.

"Now mark how this method works and how this one great schism still affects us in this country to say nothing of the countless schisms since, which have still further weakened our efforts and lessened results.

"As to what these results are to-day, let me say that it is now some four hundred years since, in various lands, those protests against human errors and corruption were made in that particular earlier Church. Those protesting set up a purer Church, now broken into many fragments. Members of the older Church and those who left it, now consider themselves enemies. The older body is compact and fully organised and against it its opponents are almost powerless. Since the rupture the newer body has had every advantage. Its members have had opportunity to study carefully and individually the word of God which has been given them freely in their own tongue, an advantage they did not have before. They have had organisation among themselves, each fragment for itself. They have had great advantages of devoted men and great supplies of money. They have used every one of the mighty inven-

tions of men for the quicker dispatch of work, the diffusion of information and knowledge, and the influencing of the minds of men, and yet, counting the whole number of Christians throughout the world, including those whom we may consider nominal only, it is doubtful if there are more Christians on the earth to-day than there were fifteen hundred years ago in the fifth century of the Christian Church. The Church is just barely holding her own and much of the work of such holding, without which the Church would retrograde, was done and is being done by those against whom the earnest men protested and their followers still protest to-day.

"We feel the difficulty more particularly in this land. Here we have, to enumerate, first, representatives of all the early Christian churches, as the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican, originally separate in organisation on geographical lines, as national churches of different nations. Later they clashed over questions of jurisdiction, doctrine, worldly aggrandisement, and personal ambitions. With these we have representatives of the followers in many lands of those who protested against the claims and errors of one of these churches, the Roman, and these again are now in almost countless fragments although all are still considered Christian. As has been said they 'have been dispersed and scattered, gathered into separate folds, arrayed as enemies under hostile banners. The whole thing is unchristian, still worse it is anti-Christian, for so long as it continues, it will be the weightiest obstruction to the progress of the Gospel. The restoration of Unity is the indispensable condition of the conversion of the world.'"[1]

"Notwithstanding certain encouraging signs we really seem to be drifting still farther apart. We emphasise differences and inculcate them as important by every means possible. Those of one fragment try to gain numbers and importance at the expense of other Christian organisations and this not only at home where there are heathens innum-

[1] John Fulton.

erable needing all our attention, but in heathen lands as well, where at least for the dignity of the Church, if for no other reason, we should stand together.

"In the connection of this Romanus, there are fraternities, one in particular,[1] thoroughly organised and equipped and having ample means and devoted members, whose object is not so much the furthering of Christ's kingdom among those who have heard not of it, as to bring back into what they consider the true fold, those who are Christians of another name. In return, what do those who are to be so proselyted do? Form so-called 'Protestant' organisations having for their object the conversion of 'Catholic' Christians, all of which, instead of tending to Christian unity and the overthrowing of the powers of evil, is simply a useless waste of energy. There are enough non-Christians in the world to engage the attention of all 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' Christians without using precious ammunition on each other, as Militant would say.

"Here is another example of want of charity and of waste. Among those which should be united under the common name of 'Protestant' is formed a society for young people, the membership of which is to include those of all beliefs. By cultivating friendliness among the young and unformed it is to be the entering wedge for a more thorough union later. Immediately are formed in each separate body of such Christians, similar societies, which are to be each under the exclusive control of a particular sect so that familiarity with others not of their own body may be avoided and there be no temptation to wander off into other folds. Class feeling is to be kept alive at the expense of Christian feeling. By reason of our manifold divisions we gain our adherents with so much labour and expense that we cannot afford to lose any. We must retain our separate existence for which with so much trouble we secure our funds.

"And here is suggested another phase of our sinful waste,

[1] The Paulist Fathers.

and one which is in itself most sinful. By reason of the sharp competition, the raising of money on which the separate existence of these sects depends, is made so difficult that we resort to questionable methods, and to such an extent that in their life and death struggles for mere existence, the churches become but mere money-getting machines. The dignity and usefulness of the whole Church are thereby sadly compromised. Rival sects and superfluous congregations impoverish each other. 'The Church is not more beautiful and winning because the congregations of its competing sects are growing adept in meretricious arts. Far otherwise. The divided Church is in humiliation and disgrace. Its impotence is perceived; it is despised. This is because it is trying to live in violation of its constitution. The Church is constituted in Unity, not in division; in Holiness, not in desecration, immodesty, vulgarity, and sensationalism; in Catholicity, not in the spirit of sectarianism. The Church will again wield its ancient sway over the hearts of men when, returning from the apostacy, absolved and regenerate, it again appears,—One, Holy and Catholic.'[1]

"Are all of these divisions or sects of churches necessary? Surely not, but which are?[2] They differ in what? In

[1] William Bayard Hale.

[2] Some one says: This Gospel that is without money and without price is beginning to cost outrageously. This is owing to sectarianism.

Again some one witnesseth: The Christian Church in America is keeping house with twelve or more kitchens; all but a few unnecessary.

Again: A boy shooting sparrows does not think it necessary to have a different gun for every sparrow.

Again: What would be said of a town that would build two bridges where one was enough because some said that a wooden bridge was best while others preferred an iron bridge, or two roads to the same place because they could not agree on the exact location; or two schoolhouses where one was enough? The children of this world are surely wiser than the children of light. One who advocated that two churches near each other would work better. each trying to excel, especially in attractions and raising money, noticed, that when one failed, the other soon lagged and died. Should we not expect that churches kept alive

unimportant details, and these little details are what keep them apart and what they fight over. They agree in many things. In fact they have more in common than they have points of difference.[1] The *differentia* make no one a better Christian citizen or neighbour, nourish no one's manhood, and save no souls. These results come from the things in which there is accord. The others simply make stronger partisans on unimportant questions, helping local pride rather than national glory. A united Church would assist nationalism. By excessive pride in one's own connection rather than the whole body of Christians, the Church of Christ, which was meant to be a chief bond of union, is to-day one of the most powerful separatists of the world.

"As to the waste of money and resources, it has been estimated that in one of our cities of moderate size, a type

---

on such a principle would come to such an end? In the first place it takes double the money to run two where one would be enough, and in the second place, the spirit of rivalry is the death of religion.

[1] Denominational divisions have been mainly made upon the least vital points, as the form in which a sacrament should be administered, some unsolvable problem in philosophy, the mode of church government, or some debatable matter of Christian morals. Some of the numerous sects into which the Christian world is divided have grown up around the ambitions and jealousies of rival leaders. Not only failing to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials, bigotry arrogates to itself the monopoly of all truth. It is never disturbed by doubts of its own infallibility. It exalts and emphasises the few minor points upon which Christians differ and minimises the grand fundamental truths that are common to all. Bigotry lays great stress upon matters of form, as posture in prayer and denominational peculiarities of worship and discipline. Bigotry puts three or four struggling churches in a little village where only one church could be maintained and where that one church could meet all the religious needs of the people.

Churchianity is not Christianity though often mistaken for it, and ambition to propagate a sect is not the spirit to win souls for Christ.

In ages past, bigotry has filled prisons and jails with helpless and innocent victims, has lit the fires of martyrdom and wrought more harm to true Christianity than all the assaults of infidelity.—*Jesse S. Gilbert.*

of many greater and smaller, money has been spent for the erection of at least sixty more church buildings than are needed by the present attendants. In the state in which this city is situated, four hundred such buildings are unnecessary, and in the country at large in so called Protestant churches, $13,000,000 has been paid out for such purpose unnecessarily.

"In our mission fields not only is there the same duplication and waste, but our show of a divided front is most disastrous to our work. We set out to bring to Christ those who know not of Him, which, in the world at large, are in the majority. This heathen world is crying for salvation and we are giving it confusion. In a certain field, perhaps inhabited by a bright but non-Christian people, are representatives of all the historic, national, and modern churches, each trying not only to teach the people of Christ but also to believe that the way of the particular body to which the representative belongs is the only true way of reaching Him."

The witness was here interrupted by the Moderator, who asked:

"Even while you are divided, and particularly while you elect to so remain, could not one class of workers select a certain portion of the field and those of another class another portion, and so do away with much of the interference and the confusion in the minds of those on whom you work?"

"We surely could, but we do not."

"Is it not then your own fault that the evils exist? Prayers are not needed to do what you know to be necessary and can do for yourselves. It would seem that you do not really want that for which you pray."

"It is hard to eradicate the ideas of a lifetime of education and to think that the particular sect to which one may belong is not necessary. It will take more than one or two generations of a different education to change our ideas. Our movement for a betterment is but about sixty

years old, with varying periods of activity. It has been about four centuries since what was to us the worst rupture took place, that which founded Protestantism. It may take an equal time at least to repair the damage then done. The tendency is in that direction but it is a question of time.

"Now what is the result of these churches and fragments of churches working in the same mission fields, interfering with each other, each thinking that he does wrong if he neglects the particular claims of his own particular body, which if he did not do, would leave no particular reason for the faith that is in him?

"If I were a heathen, and I sometimes think that by our actions we do not prove ourselves very far removed, would I under the circumstances know what to do,—which form to select? Each teacher claims to be the only true exponent of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and all who differ are in error. Would I not watch for results, or wait to see what best fits into my conception of right, or is most in accordance with the claims presented? Or would not personal friendship or social position turn the scale? Or perhaps would not I, as a heathen, come to the conclusion that after all there is no inducement or reason for a change. The results show the impotence of the workers, all due to schism. The endeavour, which might be concentrated toward the betterment of mankind, is wasted and lost. Not one intelligent man doubts the stupendous force, creative, corrective, and remedial, which could be exerted by a Christian people, at home and abroad, if they could once be united and their efforts concentrated upon the evangelisation of the world, the execution of good works, or the prevention of evil. But all appreciate the difficulties and the obstacles which have to be overcome before such unity and concentration can be made possible. That unity however is vital to the world's conversion. The world does not believe, because a divided front shows to the world our weakness.[1]

[1] Christendom is to-day moving upon heathendom with a force never

"In connection with the divided work in these mission fields, work done under divided support at home, there is another source of waste in the duplication of the costly machinery of organisation necessary to collect and forward the means of support. Hence has come the taunt of the unchristian at home, that it takes two dollars to get one dollar to the heathen, and the reproach is not without all semblance of truth!"

At this point the witness was again interrupted by the Celestial Moderator who asked:

"You speak of these differences between bodies of Christians, unimportant but yet sufficient not only to keep them

---

before surpassed. But what of the methods and strategy? Would you get the true answer of that question? Go not in search of it in the publications of the various missionary boards. Go not to the missionary boards themselves. Go not to the several legislative bodies, general conventions, general assemblies, and general conferences, which stand back of the boards, but go into the actual forces in the fields. Go to the men and women at the front, they will tell you what the trouble is. They will tell you and tell you with much warmth that one of the chief hindrances of missionary prosperity is denominational rivalry; not rivalry there, but rivalry here; not a spirit of competition and eagerness for pre-eminence among the missionaries themselves, but a spirit of competition and eagerness for the pre-eminence among secretaries, boards, commissioners, committees in the United States.

What are the most formidable obstacles that block the way to church unity? They are the traditional rivalries, the transmitted animosities and heartburnings of other generations, and scores of burning questions which would have been acknowledged burnt out years ago, had not a sense of duty to our ancestors forbidden.—*William Reed Huntington.*

Nowhere are the evils of sectarianism so apparent as in great heathen cities, where missions crowd, compete, and sometimes conflict with one another; where the heathen fancy the divisions wider than they are; where the native Christians sigh for the unity of one national Church, and groan under the burdens imposed on them by historical, doctrinal, local, or personal differences, alien to their thoughts and habits. . . . The burden of their own natural and inevitable differences is quite sufficient without the added load of such distinctions as that between the Established and the Free Church of Scotland, the Baptists and the Pædobaptists, the Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, or the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches.

apart, but to cause enmity. If these bodies are truly Christian, would not each be willing to give up at least something for the furtherance of the cause, even if it might be something which to them might seem important?"

"I am sorry to say, Sire, that all believe themselves to be in the right in everything, and we are therefore unable to give up anything, at least unless some miraculous influence, such as we could not ourselves bring to bear, so softens and impresses our minds as to make us think differently. But might I suggest that you yourself question those present as to this matter?"

"It shall be our pleasure, as this inquiry progresses, to

Each mission clings to its own converts. Each mission competes with others in its bid for the services of the best native helpers, wherever found. Each mission insists that its helpers be members of its own Churches, and looks with jealous eye on new unsectarian organisations. Thus struggling, separated communities of native Christians are supported in isolation, weakness, dependences, and sectarianism, unable to support themselves, often unwilling to make the attempt, yet claiming the services of a well-trained, high-priced pastor, and dominated over by the missionary or the mission.—*E. A. Lawrence.*

The mischief of our division lies in the waste of men and money in multiplying of churches, colleges, and theological seminaries, and distrust and jealousy between the members of the several denominations. Three to five churches in every little county seat in Kansas, the ministers preaching to congregations of fifty to one hundred, and using for their support money from the East that ought to go to the heathen, and if there were no more churches than were needed, the men might go, too. Four theological seminaries in or near Chicago, each having the labour of three to six of the ablest ministers. Two in California, because the Presbyterians would not unite with the Congregationalists to have only one. Worst of all, two for the little state of Connecticut, and of the same denomination. A denominational college for every denomination in Kansas. And in none of them is anything said to strengthen the denomination, because they want the patronage of others in the vicinity.—*The Church Union, 1898.* [Figures not materially different to-day.]

In a certain village in my diocese there were five spires pointing heavenward, but there was no settled minister because there were five parties, which, if united, would have been no more than enough for one good strong parish. Each of the five buildings was enough to contain

ask each witness who may come before us, this particular question, personally and as representing his class—but proceed."

"I was about to say, O Sire, that perhaps one of the greatest hindrances we have in working for this unity of Christians, which your Christ and ours thought of such importance as to make it the subject of a special prayer, is the fact that in our own midst, opinion is divided as to the importance of such a movement. We are not only hindered by an unwillingness to give up, but we are actually held back by the active opposition of those of our own number whom we had hoped would be our allies. There is a widely

---

the whole worshipping population. There were twenty or thirty towns in a similar condition in that county and the one next to it.—*Arthur Cleveland Coxe.*

Each of the denominations is sustaining scores, if not hundreds, of churches that are a hindrance rather than a help. Some of them have been robbed of their membership and pecuniary strength by the drift of population or commercial disaster. Others are the offspring of mistaken expectations as to the future growth and wants of the communities. Others were begotten of the superserviceable zeal of sectarian propagandists, in flagrant violation of the rights of existing churches. Others still had their origin in financial speculations, or in local rivalries, or in dissensions among brethren of other churches,—one taking as the head of its corner, stones that had been rejected by other builders. These must struggle with poverty for generations to come and are preying upon, instead of praying for, their neighbours of other names and creeds.

A few years ago a missionary went to the capital of a new territory where the Gospel had not yet been preached. He gathered a church, and Christians of several denominations promised to sustain him. But within a few weeks, three other churches were organised, partly from materials wrought into the first. They have erected houses of worship. The whole number of worshippers is about one hundred. The four clergymen are receiving each but about one half the amount paid to the teacher in the public school; must be maintained mainly by contributions from elsewhere. Yet each of these churches insists and is advised to insist, upon its right to live. With the first it is the right of the oldest, with the second the right of the strongest, with the third the right of the largest, and with the fourth the right of the highest. —*David B. Coe* (Congregational), 1874.

prevalent idea that corporate unity is not needful, or scarcely desirable, and that existing divisions do not necessarily involve the sin of schism. This is a matter which has caused me much anxiety, and it is a thing that I cannot understand. I sometimes doubt if Christian people really believe what they claim to believe as Christians. If they did they would surely, at all hazards, do away with that which so much stands in the way of the attainment of what they as Christians claim to desire above everything,—the furthering of Christ's kingdom upon earth. To such an end, if men were truly Christian, jealousy, pride, ease, or selfishness would hardly be allowed to interfere.

"As an excuse for them, it would seem as if narrowness and intolerance belong inseparably with intense human belief. There is no bigotry or narrowness that does not spring from a truth."[1]

"I am such a person as your witness describes, a hindrance if you so regard it," interrupted a voice from the audience.

"Your name, my earthly friend?" calmly interrogated the Moderator.

"Objector is my name. I want to say that such as I, want diversity with the legitimate divisions and contentions that it involves, conducted not by boors, of course, but by gentlemen. The hundred sects that divide Christendom may in some instances have their mission of evil, but in the average result they are the salvation of the Christian cause. Get a hundred people together in convention assembled, every one saying 'Yes! Yes!' to what every other person says—no division, no friction of conflicting judgments, nor shock of honest contention—why, such a condition would make earth worse than pandemonium. Malaria has its haunts in the unruffled waters. Better the tempest that keeps the waters sweet than the calm that breeds pestilence."[2]

Here the voice of Militant was again heard remarking:

[1] John Ward. [2] *Christian Register.*

"An Irishman or a Scotchman he must be. He wants fighting. Fighting has produced all the sects. In some cases the fighting was a good thing, but why keep it up after the necessity is over? In my profession, former enemies, the troubles settled, are the best of friends. If he likes fighting and thinks it a good thing in itself, he will hardly feel at home in heaven. The habit will have so grown that he will miss the excitement. But has Objector ever considered that all placid waters are not stagnant. And as for 'gentlemen' they will not stay gentlemen while the 'scrap' is on."

Here Magnate also interrupted to say:

"There are too many people employed for the amount of work required. But when you do away with some of the superfluous separate organisations, now duplicating each other, any one of which could do the work required of all, some now employed will be out of a 'job,' and those so threatened at once become interested, active opponents to prevent such concentration. I beg your pardon, but I have inadvertently used a colloquial term, 'job,' to signify any of the various forms of employment furnished by these diverse bodies to such as clergymen, professors in colleges, and teachers in schools, to officials of societies or boards who perform executive work, to caretakers of buildings, or to professional singers and instrumentalists, many of which in each department would be unnecessary if there were union. Each could as well do all the work they now do, for a much larger number."[1]

[1] Nor must we forget that the denominational idea is kept green by the denominational publishing houses and the denominational newspapers, for they have a name to make live, and by that name to make a living. The sword may make divisions, but here is a case where the pen is mightier than the sword. Furthermore, in the older parts of the country where we find churches two hundred years old, the reasons for the multiplying of churches may be various, but in the newer parts it is denominational pride. More than half of the churches in the West were started or aided by Home Mission Boards. Regardless of churches already in the field, new denominational churches were started. One

Here Objector found his opportunity to continue:

"I am bound to say I have no sympathy with that toleration which admits that another's opinion, opposed to mine, is quite as likely to be true as mine is. I must believe that my view is right—that is the reason I hold it—and my opposers are wrong, and I am bound, for the truth's sake, to deny and overcome them. I cannot see, for the life of me, why a Baptist missionary abroad should have the slightest regard for the converts of a missionary of my Church. It seems to me the other man is bound by his loyalty to Christ to steal them all if he can, baptise them properly, and make them Christians. Nor can I see what respect a consistent Methodist should have for my converts; he ought to yearn over them, plant his chapel under the eyes of my Church, and do his best to waylay them as they go to my services, get them into his prayer-meeting, and soundly convert them. I myself though have scant respect for the alleged conversion by submission to immersion, or by professed experiences, reported by Baptists, Methodists, Congregationalists, and the rest, and that, as things are, I heartily rejoice when such converts give up the vagaries of the sick and are safely housed in my Church. If we must be bigots, let us be honest about it, and if these divisions are worth maintaining at home, they are worth maintaining abroad."[1]

At this point there was another interruption by one whose name was not given or asked:

"I am not an opponent but a friend of the movement for unity. But I would urge as an excuse for those who apparently oppose, that the tendency of things everywhere is not to combine but to go to pieces. Disintegration is nat-

---

of the aggressive denominations prides itself on completing a church a day. Denominational boards must make good, and it would seem as if the bane of all church work must be the demand for statistical showing.—Chas. Samuel Tator in "The Mad Race for Souls," *Success Magazine*, February, 1911.

[1] Said in irony by William Bayard Hale, but none the less true.

ural; union is supernatural. Schism is our normal state. The more intense the condition of thought and feeling which men reach, the more evident their centrifugal tendencies become. Trains never go off the track when they are standing still. Reduce the temperature of Luther's blood five degrees and he would not have quarrelled with Zwingli; but reduce it five degrees and he could not have fathered the German Reformation. These illustrations have been cited that we may understand that if men break up into schismatic cliques it is not necessarily because they are wicked or ugly, but because of the operation in them of the centrifugence with which God primarily endowed them.

"Thinking drives men apart. If two men think exactly alike it is because neither of them thinks at all, but both leave it to a third party to do it for them. In the whole history of the Church almost every man who has had any pronounced ideas of his own has inaugurated a new school. Thought, and therefore divergency of view, is one of the distinctive features of Protestantism. On the contrary, it is part of the genius of the Catholic Church not to think. A thinking Catholic is bound to end in becoming either a Protestant or an Atheist. The boasted unity of the Roman Church is an ingenious combination of piety, organisation, and intellectual dry rot."[1]

Here the witness Romanus interrupted to say:

"May it please your Eminence, he who has just spoken refers to the Holy Church which I represent, as 'Catholic.' That is the name we claim, though I was not allowed to use it. It is our due, for our Church is, as he infers and as we claim, universal. It is true that our official title in the United States of America and in England claims but one kind of catholicity, Roman. But I should be allowed to use the fuller title as our works speak for us and show that we deserve it. The universal title is conceded to us as our right by this man, an enemy."

[1] Charles H. Parkhurst.

"An enemy! And both Christians?" said the gentle voice of Peace.

"We will hear you, Romanus, at fuller length shortly. Until then let this matter rest," ruled the Moderator.

Turning to the witness, Representative, still on the stand, the Moderator said:

"We would have you explain this term 'Protestant' just used by the unnamed witness in connection with the term 'Catholic.' I am of the opinion that it is not a term authorised by the Master."

"None of the names of these sects or fragments comes from the Christ. They are all human. Nor is the more general term for many of them, Protestant, used by his authority. It comes mostly from a Reformation which has been mentioned, which was largely the work of Luther, a man only, but one with great earnestness of purpose. This Reformation culminated some four hundred years ago, mainly in Germany, but elsewhere also. It but concentrated work done before that time and augmented it. Luther protested against errors in that large branch of the then Christian Church which was presided over by the Bishop of Rome. The term Catholic, in its proper sense, universal, comes from nearer the time when the Master was on earth, but was not given by Him. In this land it has a colloquial meaning due to our limited vision and want of intimate knowledge of the greater national churches in the world at large. Here, though there are representatives of other great churches, our habit when we use the word Catholic is to mean only the great Roman Church, and all those not Roman we group together as Protestant, though some of those so designated have never protested against Rome, being members of an independent Church, as old and in the world at large as important, the Anglican. This Church reformed herself within herself, from errors which had crept in in the course of time, without injuring her continuity with the early Christian Church. Centuries before the Bishop of Rome claimed jurisdiction over her

she had been a native Christian church in her native land. She had originally come from an entirely different line than that of Rome, and had spread to considerable size among a heathen people. She had her own ecclesiastical heads equal in rank to Rome. For centuries she was in a peculiar isolation from other portions of the Christian Church. She used her own tongue. A great Roman bishop sent a missionary to this land to help convert the native heathen peoples, when in the course of time there was Roman usurpation of the native Church, confirmed by corrupt bargains with kings without authority from the people, who in that land helped to rule. Later the usurpation was repudiated.

"The Roman Church to-day is a great church, a thoroughly organised church, with branches throughout the world, but it is not the Catholic Church except so far as it is part of the one great and universal Christian Church, whether Roman, Protestant, or otherwise. Here, in this our country, is the stronghold, more than elsewhere, of its opponents, here called Protestant, whose modes of thought flourish under our systems of education, forms of government, and freedom of action. Here are gathered the representatives and descendants of all those who opposed Rome at the time of the great protest and rupture, who are now in divisions and subdivisions of the original protesting organisations. Here therefore we say in common speech, Catholic and Protestant, meaning Roman and those not Roman."

At this point was again heard the voice of the speaker whose use of the word, Catholic, had caused the discussion.

"If you will permit me but one word more I shall not trouble you again, for I must depart. For that reason my name is not necessary. I wish only to complete my statement interrupted on account of my use of this unfortunate word, by him who calls me his enemy. My words, and those of others like me, may be interpreted as those of an enemy, but they are not so intended. But for such as I

am, it is hard, without hypocrisy, to claim as a dearest friend, one with whom we have so little in common as we have with Romanus, and with whom we are so continually in conflict. But we are learning."

"Thank the Master for that," said Peace.

"Yes, we are learning, for there are many here, both on my side and on that of my Roman friend, not enemy, who are now apparently more and more under the control of this angelic being who just now has expressed his thankfulness. And works speak louder than words or claims. I hope ours will in time. To the credit of my Roman friend many things have lately come to my knowledge, and I doubt not thousands more are hid, which show deep Christian spirit, holy life, unselfish devotion; all for the love of the Master. I hope some day he may have fuller credit from us who differ. We might with advantage profit by the example. But I wished to say further, upon the subject on which I started, that——"

"Will the witness give his name," interrupted one of the recording angels, "or our records cannot be exact."

"Since you think it necessary, though I do not, it is Encourager."

"Proceed, then," said the Moderator.

"I wished to state that, in my opinion, organisation drives men apart. The more sharply one body of Christians is organised, the more it tends to alienate from a differently organised body of Christians working alongside of it, and so it becomes a curse, which is only another name for blessing in the misuse. Though there may be need, perhaps, at present of theological fences and denominational walls, it is not quite so easy to love through a fence or over a wall as it is on open ground; and hence, under the present system, instead of forming one grand continent of Christianity, we are broken up into a little Christian archipelago; and it is only one short step from insulation to competition, and another step still shorter from competition to antagonism. It is an encouraging feature of

current Christian sentiment that men are realising so much more distinctly than ever before how much expense to the cause of Christ is involved in treating every other denomination except their own as though it were an auxiliary of antichrist."[1]

Here Objector again interrupted to say:

"I think that all figures as to the great financial waste due to division and duplication are greatly distorted. It costs nothing to stay away from church, but it costs upwards of $76,000,000 a year in the United States to go to church, besides about $20,000,000 a year collected in the church to give away. And yet there are upwards of 25,000,000 people in the churches at every principal service on the Lord's Day. The alienation of 'the masses' from the Church has been greatly exaggerated; and as long as it is susceptible of proof that church membership is on the increase, it can hardly be accepted that church attendance is declining."[2]

"To be exact," said Encourager, "I think our friend's figures allow nothing for proportional increase due to the great increase in population. But I must leave to others the work of the mathematician in which I am not an expert. The results, however, such as we desire, for the bettering of present conditions, will not come in consequence of any nice thinking, or prepared programme, but as the issue of the greater fulness of common spiritual life. The sovereign solvent of difficulty here is that men get nearer to Christ. We get near enough to our denomination and near enough to our theology. The fundamental unity of the Church is in Christ. It has always been easy to be a zealous sectarian, or to be a pronounced theologian. We can be churchmen without being Christians; we can be Calvinists and believe in depravity without its costing us a whit of our own depravity. Church, as Christ conceives it, begins not in crystallising about a policy or a dogma, nor even in union with each other; but begins in union with Him. Men do not touch each other in Christ's sense of the word except

[1] Charles H. Parkhurst. [2] *The Interior*, Chicago.

in Him. The planets are all held inside the planetary system because of the hold that the sun has upon them severally. Two distinct mountains beam upon each other across the interval of rivers and valleys because they both stand in one sunlight.

"That, then, is fundamental; that is the royal key to the situation. Men were never separated from each other by their theology or their ecclesiasticism till they had gotten away from Christ. If you can say that for you to live is Christ, and can find a Baptist, Presbyterian, and a Catholic that can say the same thing, you four could get along as comfortably together as any four of the original Twelve.

"When the tide is out you see little depressions in the beach, little pockets of water scattered here and there over the sand. When the tide comes in the pockets are there still, but so blended with the overflowing fulness that no one perceives them. The thing intended by such illustrations is that the eccentricities of a man's theology, and the peculiarities of his ecclesiasticism, do not strike down into the soil where are nourished the real outgrowths of his personal Christian life. Minds differ; hearts agree. Men that quarrel in the schools can with perfect facility fraternise on their knees."[1]

"Again I say that the Christ is to be thanked," said Peace.

"Now we begin to see the light," said the Moderator. "Here now is shown an unseen influence which before was unknown among you. It is due to the presence of this our Peace, and for this purpose was he sent. To this extent you already have answer to your prayers. Do not drive him away before your prayers are fully answered. But the nomenclature of our friend here, Encourager, bewilders us. We had thought that those of you which were not rejectors of Christ were Christians. But he calls you not Christians, not even qualified as Christians of this belief or that. He speaks of fellow Christians as Calvinists, Baptists, or

[1] Charles H. Parkhurst.

Presbyterians. Methodist and Congregational have also been mentioned by another. The array is bewildering. The terms are universally understood by you and accepted without comment, notwithstanding the absence of the Master's name. Have you so soon forgotten Him? But we neglect our patient witness here waiting. Have you anything further to offer, good Representative?"

"If you will permit me to summarise I shall be done. Briefly, as to the evils of dissensions and divisions. While such exist there can be no strength, and we are as a kingdom divided against itself. Such hindrances come largely from the abuse of the right of private judgment and are solely for evil. They absorb energy, time, and power, which might be well bestowed on better things. They furnish the infidel with arguments against the truth of Christianity. They help the devil. He, indeed in my opinion, is the chief promoter of religious divisions. If he cannot extinguish Christianity, he labours to make Christians quarrel with one another, and to set every man's hand against his neighbour. None knows better than he that to divide is to conquer. Christianity came into the world as a kingdom, and as a kingdom it won its first triumphs. Ceasing to regard itself as such, its power departed. As its unity disappeared, its increase ceased.

" Christians of this day and land have not to shame themselves for unwillingness to sacrifice in the cause, but they have reason to grieve for the inefficiency and wastefulness of their missionary machinery and the small results of their efforts. They have reason to inquire whether they are not opposed by one whom it is folly to fight against, and they should ask themselves whether they had not better learn something of the nature of the kingdom of Christ before they persevere further in an effort upon which apparently God's blessing does not rest.

" If you will permit me to speak in colloquial and local terms, using our words for our measures of value in which we calculate expense, and our religious divisional names in

which 'Christian' is always understood as included, I shall be more fully comprehended by every mortal here and therefore perhaps do the more good, though to you these terms may sound strange and meaningless."

"By all means," said the Moderator. "Speak as mortal to mortal and as fellow residents in this portion of your earth. You should be fully understood by all."

"To take a concrete example in our work of missions, the work of evangelising the world, there were in the United States in the year 1895, thirty-six missionary societies which supplied funds for such work. Their total income was $4,924,779; certainly a splendid sum, though not so splendid when divided by thirty-six. The total number of missionaries employed was 3270; a splendid army, but not so splendid when divided into thirty-six unsympathetic squads working at cross purposes. There was a total membership of 333,784 in the mission churches carried on by these societies—a most depressing figure—two sects having only seventeen adherents each. The total number of members added to the Church through the work of these missionaries during that year was 25,325.[1]

"These 25,000 converts represent a gain of four (a little over) at each church. They cost in actual outlay (to say nothing of invested funds), $200 a man, which is small enough. At this rate the conversion of humanity will cost two hundred thousand millions of dollars—a small price no doubt. But it will not be finished at this rate until the year 401,895, or 400,000 years hence. If the increase of Christians in the past 1800 years had been at a rate no higher than this there would be to-day only 50,000,000 of Christians in the world. There are, in fact, 350,000,000.

"To make up this total of 25,000, these 3000 mission-

[1] By denominational consolidation in English-speaking lands, nearly 100,000 ministers of the Gospel would be released from their present duty and rendered available for the evangelisation of heathen peoples, and nearly $100,000,000 would be set free for their support.—*Charles A. Briggs.*

aries gained for Christianity not quite eight men each. What would Saint Paul have thought of that for a year's work?

"But some of these 25,000 reported conversions are conversions merely from one denomination to another. For example, about a third of all the work done under the charge of one of these general societies was among those already Christian, such as Greeks, Armenians, and Roman Catholics. This society announced at the close of the year that the outlook was especially promising for converts from the Armenian Church, which for centuries has withstood the assault of the Turk and sealed its faith with the blood of martyrs innumerable. It has been claimed that these announced results are to be discounted. This would reduce the number of converts to 17,000 for that year.[1]

"These results are ridiculously and pitiably disproportionate to the effort. There are perhaps about fifteen millions of so-called Protestant Christians in the United States. When fifteen millions of us can show a gain of only as many thousands in a year, does it not seem that we had better abandon the work until we have cured the fault which now dooms it to failure?[2]

[1] At a meeting of the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Reading, Pennsylvania, in March, 1910, Bishop Joseph F. Berry, of Buffalo, an official visitor, made the astonishing remark that while that mighty denomination raised $49,000,000 during 1909, the increase in membership was only 65,000.

"The investment was in entire disproportion to the results," he said. "Too much money was spent for such a meagre return in souls.

"While I was informed that the reports of your district superintendents exhibited a substantial increase, the general gain amounted on the average to only two members a church. On the basis of expenditure it cost nearly $754 to bring each soul into the fold.

"Now what was the trouble? I believe in telling the plain truth. There is a waning of evangelistic fire in the hearts of our ministers.

"Money is placed above salvation. It is money, money, money!"

[2] A summary of statistics furnished by missionary workers from virtually every missionary field in the world, to a convention of the Laymen's Missionary Movement, held in New York City in January,

"There is no difficulty in determining where the fault lies. It is in our system of division. Sectarianism is responsible in the first place for an economic error in the administration of funds so grave as to be criminal. The executive work of these thirty-six societies costs far too much. Every business man feels that. The knowledge that missionary funds are not economically administered interferes with many a contribution and bequest. The Christian people of this land are burning with missionary zeal, and princely sums would be set aside for the apostolic work were there a single trustworthy and authoritative agency for their administration in the name of united Christianity.

"The extravagance of the executive work at home is a trifle compared with the wastefulness which is involved in the rivalries of missionaries of different denominations.

"The divisions are not worth maintaining, either abroad or at home. We in America are the victims of a system which polite words fail adequately to characterise—this system of sectarianism. It curses alike our society, our

---

1910, would infer that the non-Christian population of the world was being "converted" at the rate of 377 souls a day during the previous year.

If we may rely on figures, a Frenchman claims to show the relative strength of Christianity and the progress it has made in the past century. Fournier de Flaix, a well-known statistician, claims that the world's Christians in the year 1910 number 477,080,158. The other religions of the world are presented as follows: Confucianism, 256,000,000; Hinduism, 190,000,000; Mohammedanism, 175,000,000; Buddhism, 147,000,000; Taoism, 43,000,000; and Shintoism, 24,000,000; while Polytheistic systems number 117,000,000. According to the figures presented, the population of the globe is about 1,420,000,000, and the Christian adherents outnumber those of any other faith in the ratio of almost two to one.

While it is always risky to rely too much on figures, the growth of Christian adherents has been most marked during the century of modern missions. A hundred years ago, there were only a hundred and fifty missionaries in the world, but in 1895 that body had grown to 11,000 missionaries, with 40,000 native helpers, operating 12,000 missionary stations.

politics, and our religion. It divides our moral force, and arrays us against each other on every conceivable pretext, till we are as incapable as toy soldiers against united crime and organised greed. It makes of our cities unendurable examples of every species of misgovernment at the hands of insolent officials who mock the warring factions from whose indignation they are secure. It promotes industrial disturbances, instead of teaching the mutual dependence of men upon each other. It scatters our charity. It reduces Christian ministers from the service of God and humanity to scrambling mountebanks. It transforms the Church of Jesus Christ into a multitude of pauperised sects, which rival each other in vulgar means for the raising of money. It gives us a multitude of bare, mean, uninviting, debt-laden churches; a confusion of dreary services varied by sensational exhibitions; it gives thousands utterly unworthy notions of religion, and brings contempt upon the body of the Holy Christ. All this, with ills unnamed and innumerable, the paganising of immense tracts in our very midst, the loss of the sense of community, the loss of the strength which union of the intelligence, resources, and enthusiasm of all Christians would give, the destruction of comradeship among citizens, the ruin of dignified social life, the pauperisation and humiliation of Christ's religion, this is what sectarianism is responsible for. This is why we fail.

"And now shall we carry the cause of it all to foreign lands and perpetuate it there? God is merciful; He will not let us; nor will He help our efforts until we cease from our folly. What right have we to fasten the name Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist about the necks of heathens who ought to be made Christians? Where is the commission to carry Romanism, Anglicanism, or, of all the evils, Protestantism, into heathen lands?

"We have each of us the highest veneration for the particular body to which we individually belong, but any one of these is not the Church. Any one of them is but a small part of the Church.

"Those who live here may think themselves particularly fitted for missionary work, even perhaps more particularly fitted for mission work in this land. It is here that we should first bear witness to the reality of the Kingdom. When we in some measure begin to realise it here, we may begin to think of planting it in other lands. The Kingdom of Heaven is a thing of which the United States of America has hardly heard. The fact is we have yet to discover what Christianity is. I fear we have as yet done little more than play at being Christians. Who are we to call ourselves by that name, who maintain a thousand institutions of society directly opposed to the plain commands of Christ! The day of realised Christianity shall have come only when, first, the divided household of the Church shall reassemble under one roof, confess its sin, and receive absolution from above. Then it shall go out in the power of the spirit of Pentecost, to transform human society into a society founded on the laws of God, into the fashion of a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, nor any such thing. Then shall we be fit and ready to set up the Kingdom in the lands of darkness."[1]

As the witness Representative finished, the Moderator sorrowfully remarked:

" 'T is a great indictment. But the encouraging feature is that you and others like you appear to appreciate that something is wrong and desire a change. Under such circumstances the consummation may be nearer than you may suppose. The Church of Christ on earth is already a little more one than it was, or you would not be praying that it might be more one than it is. But tell us somewhat of this organisation which you represent, under whose auspices these concerted prayers have been offered."

"Fifty odd years ago," replied the witness, "there was founded in England an Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom. Its object was to unite in a

[1] From William Bayard Hale.

bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and the laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communions, for the healing of the divisions of the Church. Its members were unknown to each other. It had no organisation beyond what was needed to receive and record the names of persons willing to say the daily prayer, and if of the priestly state, to offer, four times a year, the holy sacrifice for its intention, according to custom in those communions for a special desire. The association now numbers more than ten thousand members residing in different countries; and since the year 1857, it has silently sent up its petitions that the curse of disunion may be taken away in God's good time, and according to His will. To us the time of waiting seems long and apparently there are no results. With our tiny span of life we cannot appreciate how short the time is to those who measure by infinity. The work may be going on, but in our vision we cannot see the progress. The motion is too slow for our eyes. It is certainly progressing but it will not be finished perhaps in one man's life or in that of another.

"This Association has no scheme of reunion, no plan, no programme, or platform. It has simply laid a mighty sorrow before the eyes of Christ, and asked Him to find means to take it away."[1]

The voice of Encourager was here again heard.

"Might I be permitted to say that I think our friend who has just finished his extensive testimony and to whom we are under great obligations for his amazing information, is more cast down than he need be. There are many encouraging features, Sire, supporting the inference that there may have been results already, and much ground for hope, even though we are hindered, as shown, by some who do not desire any change.

"Fifty odd years ago when his organisation was formed, the opinion was more widely current than it is to-day among

[1] From Morgan Dix.

Protestant Christians, that their divisions were inevitable, excusable, and even beneficial. It was held, and widely, that men cannot be brought to think alike on religious subjects; that it would be visionary to try to bind them in organic unity; and that it was an advantage to be broken into separate denominations, because, to use the favourite phrase, such bodies, in their rivalry, 'provoked one another to love and good works.'

"To-day it is at least harder to find an advocate of that idea. The logic of facts, the terrible progress of a deadly blight, the sight of large districts without religious services of any kind, of houses of worship dropping to decay, of masses relapsing into practical infidelity, have wrought a change in men's thoughts. A conviction prevails that these divisions among the people of Christ are a fault, and that they provoke, not to the love of God but to the stronger love of self; not to good works but to evil—to doubt, to indifference, to neglect of religious duty, and to abandonment of the profession of the Gospel. May it not be that this change in opinion forms a part of God's answer to the prayer as much as your presence here to-day? It is not hard to believe this.[1] The work is surely going on. There are lulls of inaction, of years' duration, but the subject will not down permanently. Another encouraging feature is the growing conviction that as there is so much work to do in evangelising the world with so few to do it and they of but limited powers and resources, that wherever it can be made possible, it would be better to divide the work and allow each his share, a set portion, where there shall be no interference even if the work in some one portion might not be done exactly according to the ideas of those in charge of some other portion. Such a concession may not be entirely in accordance with our present ideas, but it would at least do away with the folly of duplication and prevent us from being the laughing stock of those whom we would serve."

[1] From Morgan Dix.

"Have you anything further to offer, Representative?" asked the Moderator. "Your statements have been most exhaustive and helpful and we thank you."

"Not unless you require any further information that I can give," was the reply.

"Then it is our wish to hear one or more witnesses from each of the branches of the Church here represented so that we may learn how the question affects each in particular. Whom shall we hear first?"

The witness stand was at once occupied by Romanus, who said:

"I claim the right as the representative of the oldest Church organisation on earth to be now heard. May it please your Excellency to grant the request?"

"Your claim seems to be disputed, my friend," said the Moderator. "Yours may be one of the oldest. But we will hear you first, as older than some here represented, particularly those organisations springing from yours, separated as we understand because they have protested against your errors."

"If errors there were," replied Romanus, "they have been rectified. If they were of men and not by infallible authority of our Church, they have been acknowledged and made right. All men are human. There have also been grievous errors on the part of our opponents. Is it necessary, on either side, to go into the question of what any of us were, except for enlightenment as to what we are to-day?"

"The point is well taken," replied the Moderator. "It does not seem necessary. But, disregarding the past, it would seem that doubt still exists in the minds of your opponents as to what you now are. We would ourselves hear your claims and your reasoning to prove that they are well founded."

"I thank you for your courtesy. Were our opponents like minded, I might easily convince them."

"Proceed, Romanus, and as briefly and concisely as may answer your purpose."

ZETA

The Testimony of Romanus

"THEN I would say, your Excellency, as briefly as possible, that the Church I represent, called here the Roman Catholic Church, has been said to be Roman as to its centre and Catholic as to its circumference. I will state its claims as I know them and believe them just. Your Eminence alone can know whether they are well founded. This Church claims the exclusive right to be called the Church of Christ on Earth. We believe that the Church which Christ came on earth to establish, which was to be the Divinely appointed means for the salvation of men, is this Roman Catholic Church. This may seem a startling statement to make to you, the representative of that Divinity which knows all things, but if I so believe, it is proper to so state it.

"We also believe that outside of our fold there is no salvation. This last statement is explained by one of our pastors,[1] not to mean that none but Roman Catholics are saved. There is, we are taught, a body of the Church, and there is also a soul. The body of the Church is the visible and external part. The soul is the supernatural life of the members of the Church. Whoever is in what we call a state of grace, though outside of the visible membership, belongs to the soul of the Church. Those in the soul of the Church are saved, whether visible members or not. Who-

[1] Pope Pius IX.

ever is not so in grace, whether holding visible membership or not, is lost.

"We are the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, and as such clearly recognisable as the true Church of Christ.

"We are One because we have the most complete unanimity, of doctrine, liturgy, and government. In doctrine, the world over, we believe whatever the Church says should be believed. In ritual our forms and observances are the same throughout the world. In government, Roman Catholics are everywhere in subjection to their well ordered ecclesiastical officials of all degrees. Our working organisation is the most completely organised of any and to such an extent that it is the wonder and admiration of all, even our most bitter opponents. And it has never been denied that in unity our Church excels all others.

"As to holiness, that property is shown in its doctrines, its practice, its works, and its fruits, as manifested in the lives of departed saints of both ancient and modern times, and faithful members now living.

"It claims Catholicity, not only by first Divine commission, but in fact, in that its members constitute by far the largest body of Christians, that they are found wherever Christianity exists, and that it has existed continuously since the Church was founded by Christ through the Apostles. Hence it is also Apostolic, the more particularly as it claims that its pastors descend in an unbroken line from those Apostles. It also claims to be Apostolic by reason of doctrine. It has never given up any doctrine held by the Apostles and has never professed any not contained in Divine Apostolic tradition. From time to time it has interpreted doctrine already existing in the Church, particularly that contained in a mass of unwritten tradition left us from Apostolic times. This is acknowledged as existent, to a greater or less degree, by all Christians, inasmuch as Christ and most of the Apostles were teachers and preachers, not scribes or writers. Of this mass the

Church is the receptacle, guardian, and the living and infallible interpreter; infallible when defining faith or doctrine for the whole Church. It may be compared to the unwritten, or common law of the English nation, from which our secular laws descend, as opposed to the statute or written law. We claim that no addition has ever been made to this deposit of faith.[1]

"We claim an ecclesiastical primacy for our supreme head. Our Church is here misunderstood, I think, because our fellow countrymen are too little acquainted with Church matters as they exist beyond their own shores to know just what our Church is, its extent, or the details of its great organisation."

At this point there was an interruption in the orderly proceedings by one who wished to be heard at once, who said:

"My name is Protest, and I desire, before this witness adds to his blasphemous statements, to most earnestly request that he be not allowed to so insult the Divine Majesty which you, Sire, here represent and that you hear me before he is allowed to proceed, if it is your will that he should. To my mind it would seem that his blasphemy merits that he should ignominiously be put to silence. I wish to show briefly that he represents a so-called church which is anything but a Church of Christ. It is an abomination on the face of the earth. Its iniquities cry to heaven for vengeance, if for no other reason, because, foremost among other errors, it teaches the vile doctrine that a ministering priest, by the exercise of his priestly power, can change a piece of earthly biscuit, ordinary food, into the palpable carnal flesh of the Son of God, which a man may truly and actually take into his mouth as a piece of meat, eat, and digest it; that under the same ministrations a cup of fermented juice of grapes may become the

[1] Compiled from *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, London and Edinburgh; William and Robert Chambers Ltd., Philadelphia; J. B. Lippincott Co. Article, "Roman Catholic Church."

actual blood of Christ, that these miraculous substances, in thousands of fragments and portions, may be in thousands of places at once, and that these miracles may be continued through ages by millions of priests. It teaches that the forgiveness of sins may only be obtained through the intercession of an earthly priest. In the past, at least, it did teach that such forgiveness might be obtained by the payment of money to such an intercessor, and not only for a living applicant, but that those long dead and in torment may be relieved, one of its agents in the past claiming that the anguish of such suffering should cease as soon as the money so given should touch the bottom of the sacred chest. It teaches the worship of images or idolatry, against the definite command of God. It teaches that the earthly mother of Christ is herself perfect deity, second only to Christ Himself, never had earthly stain, and is to be worshipped and applied to for assistance as an intercessor with Christ. The ruling heads of this Church have constituted one long line of corruption. They have desired, and often obtained, other than spiritual power, which they have used through centuries whenever able, to interfere in the secular government of nations with which they had no concern. Far from being infallible as they have claimed to be, they have been the source of error and wrong. In the past they have been men of corrupt and even infamous lives, murderers, adulterers, illegitimate sons, and the fathers of such; one an infamous woman, several mere boys, some not even clergy of the Church, at times there were two or more, each, at the same time, claiming to be the true and lawful head. One aided and blessed the perpetrators of a certain massacre of the enemies of that Church, themselves Christians, which for extent and cruelty has not been equalled.

"This Church forbids the honourable marriage of its clergy, with the result that from this cause and through its secret confessional, together with the use of the power of excommunication from the Church, with the consequent dread, under their teachings, of future eternal punishment,

they have gratified their lusts, ruined women, interfered in families, set wives against husbands, perverted justice, and nullified governments. The direful weapons they thus possessed have been the more readily made effective by centralised authority obtained through oath-bound communities of men called monks, with those of women to aid, whose abiding places in the past have been nests of immorality. One of these infamous communities was composed of those called Jesuits, which in that form had to be suppressed, whose object it was to spread the belief and power of the Church no matter by what evil means, which for such good ends it was taught were permissible. It has been said of these people that they lengthened the creed and shortened the decalogue.

"This Church was the inventor of the infamous Inquisition, by which, when it had the power, unbelievers and those who believed not as it did, were tortured to death in the effort to make them embrace the true faith. Contrary to the statement of this witness, this Church has perverted and added to the faith as it was once delivered to man by Christ Himself. It has suppressed the Holy Word of God. It tries to perpetuate, in these more enlightened times, the ignorance of the Dark Ages, those of the grossest darkness when it most did flourish. Its services are held in an unknown tongue. It has been the mother of schisms rather than the centre of unity. In short, its iniquities became so great that they were unbearable and long ago, such as I am, not being able to reform it from within, came out and became separate. Here, to-day, our greatest anxiety is lest this grasping organisation should obtain by its underhand methods, as it has done in older times and in other lands, the control of our state and government, try to compel us to do service, bring upon us in this free and happy country wars, miseries, and death, and possibly put us back many ages in the world's progress."

It was noticeable during this terrible tirade, so unexpected in the midst of the peaceful proceedings, that Peace

stood, visibly agitated, held forth his hands towards the Moderator as if in appeal, but too much disturbed to speak. The Moderator had allowed the speaker to proceed as if to learn how far he would go, but at this point Protest stopped as if temporarily exhausted. Romanus at once asked that he might reply in detail, but the Moderator said:

"Is it necessary? What organisation of the Church of Christ on earth in the past has not been corrupt, as it has gone its own way unmindful of Christ, and has had the power? Would not any one of them to-day be as corrupt, be guilty of any or all of these iniquities, if free from opposition and control, so obtaining the power, and if it had held that power long enough to become corrupt? The absence of trouble to purge and the presence of much prosperity would do much to vitiate. But we should say that all this history of the corrupt past is not necessary to this inquiry. On the point raised by Romanus I would rule that what we want to know is not what any of you were, but what you are. You undoubtedly, in civil proceedings, have statutes or laws of limitations which apply to wrongs of too old a date to matter in the affairs of to-day. Such rules shall apply here. Perhaps, kind Romanus, you might be willing to allow Protest to state more exactly just what he considers are the present errors of your Church. We will then allow you to reply in detail with such statements as you may think necessary."

"That I should be pleased to do, your Eminence, and should consider it but a fair proceeding were it not, that though I can hear almost unmoved most of these lying statements concerning my Church, because I know them to be untrue, I cannot, unmoved, listen to the ravings of one who speaks in such impious and irreverent terms of the most Holy dogma of our faith, the perpetual miracle of the substitution of the most Holy Body of Christ, for the natural elements in the sacrifice of the mass, the firm belief in which, is the corner-stone on which rests our entire faith, our hope of salvation, our reverence for all things

divine, and our help to a holy life. By its means, thousands of faithful followers of the Master are in daily communion with Christ.

"The most important duty of our ministering clergy is, as sacrificial priests, to offer this Holy Sacrifice for the good of mankind. Viewing it as we do, as the most Holy and necessary thing in our spiritual life, we cannot but be deeply shocked and our most sacred instincts outraged, by the ravings of a man like this, who has no reverence whatever for sacred things, nor any consideration for the most tender feelings of others. This man cannot have such a consuming love for his Church as we have for ours. If we err in having too great a veneration for so sacred a thing, if that were possible, though I cannot imagine how it could be, is it not better to err on the side of reverence than on the side of blasphemy? No harm can be done by too great reverence, but much by blasphemy."

"Good Romanus," said the Moderator, "the Christ you serve cannot be far displeased by an excess of zeal on His behalf, but if you will kindly, of your courtesy, allow our friend Protest to proceed, we assure you that his words shall not again so offend. By so doing it will better enable you to know the grounds of complaint. You can then more effectively reply."

"As you will," said Romanus, who then withdrew temporarily and Protest took the stand.

"As you rule, Sire," said this witness, "that past history concerns not this inquiry, I shall not go into it, but I would like to make the mere statement, as is but fair, that the Catholic Church, which is the name by which we know the organisation represented by the last witness, is not to-day, particularly among us, as bad as it has been in the past. To a certain extent it has reformed itself."

"You mistake our meaning," interrupted the Moderator. "So far as past history is concerned, the good, that which lives after those who do it are gone, as a part of honourable history, should indeed be counted for credit, but as for the

bad, let it not be remembered. Who is there among you that is wholly good?"

"Then, O Sire, as I understand you, the mention of past history of the Church in question may be permitted if I confine myself to that which is good. But in this case there is no good, nothing but evil. For one thing the Church represented by this Romanus has claimed authority not only over the minds but the bodies of men, and under her claims for precedence, of all men. I insist that it has perverted the truth, inaugurated war, grasped political power, proclaimed itself infallible, and has sold indulgence to sin. It has sought to overthrow governments. It has employed the dungeon, the halter, the rack, and the stake, in its war against truth. It has used lying, assassination, and wholesale massacres in propagating its power, and crushing its enemies. It has cursed men while living and tried to damn them when dead. Pope Julius put to death 200,000 Christian Protestants in seven years. The French Catholics massacred 100,000 Christians in three months. Roman Catholics killed fully 1,000,000 Waldenses. The Jesuits destroyed 900,000 persons in thirty years. Under the Catholic Duke of Alva 26,000 Protestants were executed by the hangman. Irish Catholics massacred 150,000 men, women, and children. These all in addition to the record of the awful day of Saint Bartholomew already referred to. The whole number of persons massacred by the papacy is estimated at fifteen millions, and the estimate is a low one."

A motion made by Peace here caused the Moderator to stop the witness with the remark:

"We are of the opinion that you abuse our courtesy and do not heed our admonitions. Most of these statements you have already made, and beside they are lacking in proof. The line of argument you adopt surely cannot promote the object for which we have come together but rather tends to defeat it."

"I crave your pardon, Sire. I speak from a full heart, as

one who feels deeply. I shall try to confine my objections to more pleasant lines and to place them more orderly.

"To start again, I would say that the so-called Catholic Church in our day is really composed of two factions, though its members will not allow that statement. There is the liberal faction, more largely represented in this liberal land, where its members can not but be affected by their surroundings, though its origin is not here. This faction is the one ground of hope for the entire body. It is the party of reform within that Church. It is the successor of the party that did away with the grosser errors which had produced the revolt and schism of the great Reformation. After that event it greatly purified the parent body. To-day the members of this party are not intolerant, are abreast of the times, and are men of learning and of all Christian virtues. Against them is arrayed the conservative party, or those who are designated as 'Beyond the Mountains,' that is in Italy, the home of the centralised government of the Church. Here abides the so-called Curia or hierarchical management, secular and spiritual, which is composed, almost exclusively if not entirely, of persons of that local race which has little in common with us. They at times elect to the supreme chair a man of piety and attainments, like the one who now holds the office, but his power is not absolute. The political machinery of the party which elects him really controls him in various ways. Those who control this machinery are narrow minded men, men who hold back rather than advance, men of intolerance, men who are politicians and desire power and influence for themselves and their party, who love not the Church for its own sake. But perhaps I should not particularise, for who, not within the inner circle, can know for a certainty as to these things?

"If you would see results look to lands where this Church has been in undisputed control for centuries and then at more enlightened lands, like our own, where her claims are questioned. In her territory, for instance, mark how such

things as shameless swindles, by means of invented relics, and sham miracles, are still in vogue. This Church teaches a belief in modern miracles, not only in the offering of the mass but in the ordinary affairs of life. The offering of her masses for the saving of the souls of the living and the alleviation of the agonies of the dead, may still be secured by the payment of money, and for this purpose, in her native home, such masses are bought and sold in the open market; and in a still less enlightened country I have seen her priests conduct a lottery, which is the selling for a small sum of chances for prizes, to be awarded by lot, the prizes in which were a greater or less number of masses to be said for the benefit of the winners, or for the repose of the souls of their deceased relatives who might be suspected to be in need of such assistance.

"The adherents of this religious system known as Romanism, as Romanus has said openly, claim that they, and they alone of living men, are in communion with the true Body Mystical of our Lord Jesus Christ. In their view the Papal Church is the Catholic Church; and if the Catholic Church, then the Church of the Apostles; and if the Church of the Apostles, then the Church of Christ; and if the Church of Christ, then the City of God, the Kingdom of Heaven upon Earth, and the Mother of us all.[1]

"This Church desires unity, but how? By taking all things to herself as the serpent swallows the bird. We, the bird, are not willing."

"Friend," said Moderator, "how is it, if as you say, this Church is in error and ever has been, that it has produced such great results in numbers? She would seem to be a mighty power with millions of loyal members, who like our friend here waiting to be heard, love her dearly."

"That, Sire, is the result of far-seeing good management, the wisdom of the serpent and political trickery, by which means she has imposed upon her people, many of whom are

[1] William R. Huntington, *The Church Idea.*

ignorant. With many of these she has the advantage, that she has been their spiritual mother for ages. Her children, born in her fold, have the instincts of filial love. Her very size, once it is attained, gives her power to attract. Men go with the crowd, it is not so lonely. They are largely influenced by what others do. Her efforts have been in a great degree successful, and, as we say, nothing succeeds like success. Then she has the strength of claims once made, and persistently clung to. Men will believe anything, any lie, even he who first enunciated it, if it is sufficiently reiterated. This Church does not argue.[1]

"The Americans, as we call our people, have a certain love for antiquity because we have it not ourselves. Rome says she is the oldest, and through her persistence in the statement, we gradually permit the claim, though she, as the Roman Church, is not so old as the original Christian Church, of which we are all integral parts, nor as old as the portion of the Early Church now existing known as the great Eastern Church, a mighty aggregation from which Rome is divided. Rome says that she alone has authority and that the only way to have real authority is to centralise it as she does; and, weary of divisions, many admit both claims in the effort for betterment.

"She manipulates the statements of history, misstating them and covering up its unhappy elements, trusting to a too common ignorance and consequent inability to contradict on the part of those who should oppose her. Trading on this ignorance, she dazzles by the importance of her assertions as well as by her size. She uses the inherent attractions of mystery, secrecy, and wonder. By the faith of her members, miracles of healing do indeed come to pass,

[1] The prosperity of the Roman Catholic Church is largely due to its putting all the eggs in one basket and then watching that basket. The Romanists have larger congregations in their churches, not because there are more of them, but because they are together.—Chas. Samuel Tator in "The Mad Race for Souls," *Success Magazine*, February, 1911.

though the occasion is fraudulent. She uses the power of the æsthetic in ceremony and ritual. She appeals to the conservative in a time of change and unrest. She poses as the haven of peace, when she is at bitter enmity against all others; as unity itself, but with others she is not at unity, and in herself she has the unity of silence and oppression."[1]

"Friend," said the Moderator, "by your own statements, all this seems to be in the line of earthly wisdom. If such earthly wisdom produces such great results, might not you to advantage adopt such tactics for your Church's welfare?"

"And would you, Sire, advise such methods?"

"You have spoken, Friend, as though the affairs of this world were governed entirely by man without divine supervision. Granted, as you claim, that this Church has been so corrupt in the past, has not God the power to so govern the affairs of men as to make all things, even evil, work together for good? Mighty results, to an unprejudiced outside observer, might suggest the thought that a higher power than that of man was exerting some influence."

"We cannot but believe it, if you, Sire, suggest such a possibility. But kindly allow me once more, even at the risk of slight duplication, to try to put my objections in more orderly form than they will insist upon presenting themselves to my mind from the very earnestness of my purpose."

"You may proceed."

"Briefly then, we believe that to-day, as in the time of our Lord's immediate successors, it is wrong to add to or take away anything from the first faith which our Lord Himself delivered to the Church when He founded it upon earth, as wrong as it was in an older time when God said to a leader of His people after His law had been made known, 'Ye shall not add unto the word that I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it.' Our charge is that this now corrupt Church has greatly added to the

[1] James Sheerin.

pure faith as first given to the Early Church, and for which additions there is no authority in the one great authority of our faith, the Holy Scriptures, which according to our belief contain all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.[1] These Scriptures themselves have been and are perverted by this Roman Church and have been and are withheld, as much as possible, from its members as requiring explanation by Church officials to their proper understanding, and this withholding is part of my charge. Among its errors, as already stated, it claimed at an early date pre-eminence for its ruling head, not only over all other heads and churches, but over kings and kingdoms, and over all mankind, both spiritually and bodily, which claim has since of necessity been modified, but yet held to as much as circumstances will permit.[2] It now adds the belief that this head is infallible in utterance.

"This Church has set up as God, the mother of Christ, as herself a God second in power and influence only to Christ Himself, who should be worshipped and prayed to as God, that she, more tender as a human mother, might intercede for us with her more austere Son, all contrary to the faith first delivered to the Church. To this erroneous belief it has now added that of the Godlike and entire sinlessness of this holy, but human woman while on earth, which we believe was alone the attribute of Christ Himself. Again it adds the doctrine that this mother of Christ was taken into heaven, as was Christ, without death, which is without warrant in Holy Scripture.

[1] XXXIX Articles, Art. VI.

[2] The Pope's full title is "Bishop of Rome and Vicar of Jesus Christ, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, Patriarch of the West, Primate of Italy, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Roman Province, Sovereign of the Temporal Dominions of the Holy Roman Church."

"It has claimed the power of defining who among the faithful dead are veritable saints of God, a thing not so repulsive in itself if that Church did not say that those so deified had Godlike powers, could intercede for us with God for the forgiveness of sins, for the alleviation of torment, and for ultimate salvation, and to that end, and for help in this life, these former human beings, now in a better state, should also be prayed to as to God.

"This Church has ordained seven sacraments as miraculous religious rites, five we claim of earthly origin, as against the two which were ordained by Christ Himself. In connection with one of these she has gradually grown to believe and teach the monstrous doctrine mentioned which we know as Transubstantiation.[1] This sacrament has also been

[1] *The Doctrine of the Real Presence.*—All Christians in the Early Church believed that the bread and wine offered in the Eucharist were made by consecration to be truly the Body and Blood of Christ. The presence, in modern language, was believed to be objective, *i.e.*, not dependent on the minds of the receivers. But no assertion was made as to the manner in which Christ came to be present, except that it was through the operation of the Holy Ghost and Christ Himself.

Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation.—The philosophers of the Middle Ages believed that things consisted of substance and accidents. The accidents of a thing are what can be apprehended by the senses (*i.e.*, colour, shape, taste, chemical properties, etc.); the substance is a mysterious something which is supposed to remain when all these are taken away, and which yet makes the thing to be what it is. This theory came to be applied to the Eucharist, and it was held that the *substance* of the bread and wine was by consecration changed into the *substance* of Christ's Body and Blood, the *accidents* of the bread and wine (*i.e.*, everything that in modern language we should call *material*) remaining the same. The name of transubstantiation was sanctioned by the Lateran Council of 1215, and the doctrine was further defined at the Council of Trent, which ended in 1563. Meanwhile the word substance had come to be equivalent in popular use to the substance combined with the accidents, and at the time of the Reformation the doctrine was commonly supposed to imply a change in the accidents as well as the substance, *i.e.*, a material change. . . . It must be noted, however, that neither the doctrine of Consubstantiation [Lutheran] nor that of Transubstantiation, as now defined by the Roman Church, necessarily implies or even suggests a *material* presence of our Lord's

mutilated by refusing one of its elements to all but the clergy. Again this Church has taught officially, though perhaps not now as a formal doctrine, the belief that sins can be atoned for, after death, by the fires of purgatory. Then she has many 'Pious Opinions,' almost as binding as dogma, some of which in the past have in time been defined as dogma. Among these is the belief that salvation is to be obtained not alone by faith on the Son of God as the Divine Mediator, but by good works. The deluded members of this fraudulent Church believe that through good works, done not from gratitude and love of Christ, but as an equivalent for value received, men may be saved, as if our feeble efforts could match God's mercy. I confess I have small opinion of one who goes to Mass, or gives money to the poor, or helps his fellow man, simply to save his skin and enter heaven."

The Moderator here recognised one who had spoken before, Objector, who rose, he said, to a point of order, and only for a moment.

"Though I am not greatly in sympathy with the purposes of this inquiry, I love fair play. They say that it is only that I love to object. But I wish to ask if any one, who by the Supreme Master should be considered worthy to enter His blessed abode, should have that right questioned by any one who, if he should be there at all, would himself be a guest? Our friend Protest speaks as if he would like to regulate such admissions — as if, should certain of his opponents be admitted, his enjoyment would be spoiled."

"Do not worry, Objector," said the Moderator. "In your Father's house are many mansions. If Protest cannot conceive of himself, in a future state, as more capable of a larger Christian charity, he may comfort himself with the

Body in the Eucharist. The conception of substance may be antiquated, but it does not mean anything material.—From note, "The Doctrine of the Eucharist" in *The History of the Book of Common Prayer*, by J. H. Maude. New York, Edwin H. Gorham.

thought that he will not necessarily have to live with any whom he cannot approve. It would seem as though this idea should give many mortals much comfort."

Protest again resumed:

"Notwithstanding the denial of Romanus, it is the general belief of his fellow members that none but they, can possibly be saved. They also say that our clergy are no clergy."

Said a voice from the audience:

"Do not all Catholics go to Hell? I was taught so."

The Moderator recognised the interruption sufficiently to ask:

"Will the mortal who has just spoken say what he means by Hell."

"A place of torment—fire, eternal damnation. No let up to it and no getting out of it. Forever."

"To you, forever is a long time. Who taught you this doctrine?"

"My father and my father's father before him."

"Is it of Christ?"

Before reply could be made, some one was heard to say:

"My name is Greatheart. If it may please you, I ask that you pass this subject for the present. Later, when it may be agreeable, if I may plead slightly for my friend Romanus, whom I love as a worthy man, though not his brother in the faith, I should like to touch upon this matter, almost as in apology, not only for him but for ourselves."

"May it please you to do this, O Sire," said a member of the Commission, Charity, who had heretofore spoken but little.

"It is so ordered, if for no other reason, in courtesy to our much loved Charity whose opinions in this inquiry are of great value."

"Then may I proceed further?" asked Protest.

"Have you much more to say?"

"What may be added further is not lengthy. I have endeavoured to observe strictly your instructions not to

mention the evils of the past. But there are many here who feel as deeply as I do, in opposition to this Church of Romanus, which we cannot but believe is a church but in name, is composed of worshippers of images or idolaters, is an arch enemy of mankind and of progress, an arch deceiver and a sink of immorality——"

Here Peace rose as if to speak, but the Moderator interposed:

"Friend, we are of the opinion that you are again abusing our courtesy which allowed you to continue on condition that you exceed not our limits. The statements you make can do no good in the present inquiry, but on the contrary may do great harm. It is with much regret that we are compelled to rule that you shall be heard no longer."

"May it please you, Sire," said Greatheart, "I would like to say here, if I may be allowed——"

"Do allow him, O Sire," ejaculated Charity, and the Moderator indicated assent.

"Thank you," said Greatheart. "I wished but to say that though there may be many here who feel strongly, as our brother, in opposition to the teachings of the body of Christians under discussion, yet there are many whose sentiments I voice, who while not of her, in fact are active in bodies opposed to her, yet have no feelings of enmity but rather those of friendship. They cannot but acknowledge many courtesies from representatives of that communion, they can willingly bear witness to good done, and to saintly lives of many of its members, in the past and present. In some ways we could give more convincing testimony as to excellence in this Church of Romanus than Romanus himself, from the fact that we, as outsiders, can speak more freely than he would be allowed to speak, and we would commend only what is undoubtedly good, without trying to apologise for what to most men seem errors. If Romanus would but concede that his Church has at times been in the wrong, his claims would be more

readily conceded, for then the fathers of his Church would seem to be but human, as were ours.

"In my opinion only bitterness and antagonism can result from such unchristian charges as those of Protest against the moral teaching of the Church of Rome. Every one knows that if the Roman Church did regularly teach her people to break the Ten Commandments, she would long ago have been swept away by the indignant wrath of that deep moral sentiment, which even an imperfect Christianity always develops. Nor would the modesty and purity of the great mass of healthy men and women in her fold tolerate the confessional if the gross abuses of the past, which the Romanists themselves admit, were the rule and not the exception. To prove his charges he would have to rely upon evidence a thousand, or at least five hundred years old, as though the world had not moved since the days when men tortured heretics and burnt witches.

"The error of this Church, by its opponents' statements, are largely those of adding to the faith. It has enlarged, not lessened. I believe that nothing vital has been thrown away. In faith, it believes all that it ever did. Romanus believes everything that is believed by Protest. And besides are not both Christians? Do not both love our beloved Master, one perhaps more affectionately, openly, or reverently, than the other, but each in his own way, as different natures show affection differently?"

At this point, Representative, who, as the first regular witness had stated the case at the opening of the hearing, asked permission to make a statement regarding the historic line of ecclesiastical rulers in the Church of Romanus, "of which," said he, "too little is known. I, as an outsider, should like to show for the enlightenment of those ignorant, and as an aid to their kindliness, just how the Papal claims for precedence arose which are now rejected by those not of the Roman faith."

To this the Moderator replied:

"To you as our first witness we are under obligation and we would gladly grant your request, but have you considered that you are trying the patience of your friend Romanus, who is waiting? He has not been heard in full, and beside has a right to make defence against the serious charges which have been preferred."

"I am in the hands of my friends," said Romanus. "The more you permit them to say, the less I have to say on my own behalf. Those not of my faith seem to be conducting my defence. I should be pleased to hear this statement and I am convinced that it will not be far from the truth."

"Then proceed, Representative."

"I wish but to say, Sire, that many of those in this line of ecclesiastical rulers, who in the past have guided the affairs of this Church of Romanus, have been great men, learned men, real rulers of the world in troublous times, powers for good, though some have been evil. The tradition of that Church is that Peter, the Apostle of the Lord, was the first of the line, but before the Roman Empire became Christian the record is obscure. On account of Rome's position as mistress of the world, the Bishop of the Imperial City, as Christianity gained power, had special dignity, and his judgment was weighty. He became the champion of orthodoxy, his Church of catholicity, and certain representative Church councils gradually came to regard him as having appellate jurisdiction. A great ruler[1] claimed superiority over western Christendom and his power during a series of barbarous invasions, when the secular arm was paralysed, gave to him and his successor[2] commanding influence. The change of the secular seat of government eastward left the pontiff the only influence of importance at the old centre of the Empire, Rome. Empires disintegrated but he remained stable. Neglected by its imperial masters, the city found protection, as under a prince, in an ecclesiastical ruler.[3] There were reversals at

[1] Innocent I. [2] Leo I. [3] Gregory the Great.

times but the power of the heads of the Church increased and spread even to far England.

"Bargains with princes, to strengthen in political quarrels, gradually brought into subjection foreign prelates, of equal rank as churchmen but who were influenced by political masters. In a dark time, with schism in the east and invasion from pagans in the south, the pontiff sought aid everywhere against the foes of Christendom. On the breaking up of another empire[1] there was anarchy in Italy.[2] Then the Church rulers were tools in the hands of rival competitors for power. Elections to the sacred chair were held by any who chanced to be in power, whether foreign or otherwise, at times by a mob with no authority whatever. No one had reverence for the office and several occupants were fierce and unholy men.

"A German prince brought regeneration, and his choice, a German pontiff, revived ecclesiastical discipline and again secured the respect of Christendom.[3] Then came a mighty ruler in the Church.[4] He decreed the election of the supreme head by high officials of the Church, and enforced clerical celibacy so that the clergy, unhampered, might devote themselves to the Church.[5] Simony, or the purchase of ecclesiastical preferment, was suppressed, and the clergy were forbidden to receive the investiture of benefices from lay hands, which touched the sovereignty of princes and the Church's claim to be head over kings. On this issue the Ecclesiastic was able to depose an emperor.[6] In

[1] Carolingian.

[2] Latter part of the tenth century.

[3] Henry III. and Leo IX.

[4] Hildebrand, Gregory VII.

[5] Every great political transformation has tended to carry the Church with it in imitation of whatever change is generally welcomed as a reform. So Hildebrand found that the shift of the feudal system from life-tenure of benefices to hereditary tenure was bringing the Western Church under the yoke of a hereditary clergy; and he established the rule of clerical celibacy to avert the calamity.—From *The Historic Episcopate*, by Robert Ellis Thompson, Philadelphia. The Presbyterian Board of Publication.

[6] The Emperor Henry IV.

a war with a subsequent emperor,[1] power was added to the representatives of the Church until the period of greatest authority[2] when mighty kings, including those of France and England, heeded the rebukes of Rome.

"In subsequent political struggles Rome needed money which was extorted from foreign countries and the pontiff again lost repute. After deposing a French king, a pontiff[3] tried to usurp an emperor's place as the head of Europe, which brought violent opposition from France and England, both budding into mighty monarchies, and death to the usurper while a prisoner in France. A French pontiff followed, he and his immediate successors being compelled to reside in France, where luxury and corruption prevailed in the ecclesiastical court, and the character and claims of the papacy were questioned and attacked on ecclesiastical grounds. Large sums of money were raised for the papacy from national churches by questionable means. A period of troubles and rival popes preceded one of magnificence and greatness for the Papal See, then again in Rome.[4] Then came lust for secular power, rank corruption with demands for reform, culminating unexpectedly not in reform from within but in an absolute break with the past in the Protestant Reformation. Instead of the enforcement of the law of the Church, the law itself was repudiated. Then came reform from within also and by the authority of a general council.[5] Then a period of decline and then one of renewed spiritual gain following the release from secular activity.[6]

"Now that the matter of history is out of the way," said Representative, in conclusion, "I hope that Romanus will at last be heard in his own defence."

"Not yet, may it please you." The speaker was Greatheart. "I wish to say a few words more."

[1] Frederick [2] Under Innocent III. [3] Boniface VIII.
[4] Nicholas V., fifteenth century. [5] Trent.
[6] Compiled from *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, London and Edinburgh; William and Robert Chambers Ltd., Philadelphia; J. B. Lippincott Co. Article "Pope."

"Our friend, and he is a friend of everybody, is one of the irrepressible kind," remarked Representative.

"May it please you to hear him," said Charity.

"What do you say, Romanus?" asked the Moderator.

"I shall be only too glad to hear him. My friend Greatheart is a perpetual apologist and a professional sayer of pleasant things. And it is most remarkable that when he speaks, we are all pleased, and we all believe him whether he speaks truth or not."

"Would there were more like him," observed Charity. "In that case our business here would soon be ended."

"It would seem that we must again hear you, Greatheart. Proceed."

"I would, Sire, simply urge the expediency of the correct choice of methods in dealing with the question of this Church of Romanus, if we are ever to arrive at conclusions. There are two methods, one of denunciation, the other of calm and impartial inquiry. The former is the easier. With those already opposed and of narrow minds, it is more effective than argument. It is easy to use bad epithets. It is claimed in excuse for the use of that method, that it is but returning in kind what has been given us. If so that is an additional reason why it should be avoided, because it works both ways.

"I claim that a Romanist, who knowingly obeys the commands of his Church, will be a good man. One not a member of that Church can hardly appreciate what that Church is. We all have similar traits in our nature. Were we members of that Church, we should love it also. I respect it as a part of the Church of God. That larger Church is composed of all who have the spirit of Christ, whether Greeks, Papists, or Protestants. Some of the most lovely and lovable saints I have ever known, were Roman Catholics. I have met women of the Russian Church who were a living apostrophe to Charity. In all departments of Protestantism are redeemed ones, walking in white,

whose consecration is in heaven.[1] It is not only organisation and unity of doctrine that gives the Roman Church its power, of which there is so much dread. It is the grace of God, and a godly life among its members. A saint has said, 'Give me twelve men of self-renunciation and I will convert the world.' Millions of Roman Catholics, who live in daily remembrance of Christ, hardly think of the pope, or if they do, only that they may ask that as chief pastor he may give spiritual profit to the members of the flock. The making known to the whole world, what Christ has taught, and the getting done what He has commanded, are the ultimate objects of Peter's pence and papal pageants, and pageants may be most effective preaching.[2]

"In one thing this Church has been criticised—for holding a belief in purgatory. To you, Sire, who know of all beyond this life, our gropings in the dark after things which have been revealed to us but in part may seem unreasonable. But to my mind this belief in purgatory is one of the strongest holds that this Church has on its devoted members. It is the most profound consolation that can be offered to the bereaved or the penitent. The Protestant reformers repudiated the belief, at least as to torture and punishment, but put nothing in its place to fill the void. And yet the belief, in some form, of a middle state, or of probation after death, is constantly in Scripture and in Creeds, and all are now gradually returning to some form of belief which will include divine discipline and a gradual Christian sanctification after death. There are so many good sinners whom we want saints and so many saints who would make heaven itself uncomfortable if they got there too soon. Nor can we believe that a just God will hurl to everlasting damnation, millions of infants and heathen, who cannot be saved by faith alone, or even have had the benefits of the waters of baptism."[3]

[1] John P. Newman. (Methodist.) [2] Martin Mahoney

[3] There must be moments, in Rome especially, when every man of friendly heart, who writes himself English and Protestant, must feel

"Your pleading is soothing, Greatheart," said the Moderator, "but we fear you have forgotten our patient Romanus who still waits to be heard."

"I make way for him most cheerfully, Sire."

"Then proceed, Romanus."

"There is but little more, your Eminence, that I can

---

a pang at thinking that he and his countrymen are insulated from European Christendom. An ocean separates us. From one shore or the other one can see the neighbour cliffs on clear days. One must wish sometimes that there were no stormy gulf between us; and from Canterbury to Rome a pilgrim could pass, and not drown beyond Dover. Of the beautiful parts of the great Mother Church I believe among us many people have no idea; we think of lazy friars, of pining cloistered virgins, of ignorant peasants worshipping wood and stones, bought and sold indulgences, absolutions, and the like commonplaces of Protestant satire. Lo! yonder inscription, which blazes round the dome of the temple, so great and glorious it looks like heaven almost, and as if the words were written in stars, it proclaims to all the world that this is Peter, and on this rock the Church shall be built, against which Hell shall not prevail. Under the bronze canopy his throne is lit with lights that have been burning before it for ages. Round this stupendous chamber are ranged the grandees of his court. Faith seems to be realised in their marble figures. Some of them were alive but yesterday; others, to be as blessed as they, walk the world even now doubtless; and the commissioners of heaven, here holding their court a hundred years hence, shall authoritatively announce their beatification. The signs of their power shall not be wanting. They heal the sick, open the eyes of the blind, cause the lame to walk to-day as they did eighteen centuries ago. Are there not crowds ready to bear witness to their wonders? Is there not a tribunal appointed to try their claims, advocates to plead for and against; prelates and clergy and multitudes of faithful to back and believe them? Thus you shall kiss the hand of a priest to-day, who has given his to a friar whose bones are already beginning to work miracles, who has been the disciple of another whom the Church has just proclaimed a saint,—hand in hand they hold by one another till the line is lost up in heaven. Come, friend, let us acknowledge this, and go and kiss the toe of St. Peter. Alas! There 's the Channel always between us; and we no more believe in the miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury, than that the bones of His Grace, John Bird, who sits in St. Thomas's chair presently, will work wondrous cures in the year 2000: that his statue will speak, or his portrait by Sir Thomas Lawrence will wink.—WILLIAM M. THACKERAY, *The Newcomes*.

say or need to say. To our friends who know us so well, we need not speak, and on those who always view us with suspicion, and misinterpret all I say, I could make no impression. Still there are a few more details which might be added.

"I could claim for instance, that we as a church had no connection with a certain massacre which has been referred to. That was the work of some of our unworthy children for personal ends, of whose deeds when they were understood, we disapproved entirely. As well might I hold all Protestants responsible for the crimes and persecuting spirit of the most notorious of English monarchs.[1]

"The grandeur of our Church consists in the fact that we follow the Divine command to teach all nations. Jesus Christ is the only religious founder who had the courage to say to His disciples, 'Go teach all nations.' All other religions have either been national, like the Jewish religion; or territorial, like Mohammedanism; or state religions, like the Greek Church. Our Catholic religion alone, as the name implies, is universal, cosmopolitan, world-wide. Its faith and government are like the wonderful concord and harmony which pervade the planetary system. The Catholics of the world[2] all have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one creed. They receive the same sacraments, they worship at the same altar, and pay spiritual allegiance to one common head. How sublime and consoling is the thought that, whithersoever a Catholic goes over the broad world, whether he enters his church in Pekin or in Melbourne, in London, or Dublin, or Paris or Rome, or New York or San Francisco, he is sure to hear the self-same doctrine preached, to assist at the same sacrifice, and to partake of the same sacrament. And we claim that its creed is now identical with what it was in past ages. The same gospel of peace that Jesus Christ preached on the Mount, the same doctrine that Saint Peter preached at Antioch and

[1] Henry VIII.

[2] Now approximately 300,000,000.

Rome, Saint Paul at Ephesus, Saint John Chrysostom at Constantinople, Saint Augustine in Hippo, Saint Ambrose in Milan, Saint Remegius in France, Saint Boniface in Germany, Saint Athanasius in Alexandria; the same doctrine that Saint Patrick introduced into Ireland, that Saint Augustine brought into England, and Saint Pelagius into Scotland, is ever preached in the Church throughout the globe from January to December. 'Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day and forever.'[1]

"As to this original faith and doctrine, I claim that we do derive it from more than happens to be set down in written Scriptures. There is not an ecclesiastical body on earth to-day that does not derive its belief more or less from tradition. The difference between them and us is, that they are not agreed as to what shall be accepted and what shall not, nor can they agree as to who shall draw the line. Some reserve the right for each believer to accept or reject what may please him. We reserve that right to the Church. Our Church, or its head speaking for it, does not originate any doctrine or belief. We have here a secular example, a Supreme Court of the land—a final court—of last resort. No one claims that this Supreme Court makes the laws. The meaning of legislation may be disputed for years, but when the Supreme Court speaks, the meaning is fixed. We do not put a copy of the law in the hands of each citizen and say 'Interpret these for yourself,' and yet that is the system of Protestantism.

"Papal authority and Papal infallibility both come from Apostolic Times. As for the latter, it is only when there is dispute that an authoritative definition is necessary. In fact, once the Apostolic authority is admitted, it must be followed by infallibility, which in other words is but correctness of definition. Infallibility stands only for the formal announcement of what, under Divine guidance, has gradually become the firm and unalterable belief of

[1] Cardinal Gibbons.

the Church, which is then put in official form, and the statement is only infallible when thus made by the authority of the Church.

"Our Papal authority is centralised and effective for work, in sharp contrast with the thousand warring sects of those opposed to us. Our opponents must admit, even if they claim that we have not catholicity, that we have all the machinery necessary to produce it,[1] and that is sufficiently extensive to control, if may be, the entire Church of Christ on earth.

"With this conception of a world-wide Church comes in the manifest advantages of a universal tongue for her services the world over, though there are exceptions to the Church's practice in its vast area, for Rome has learned to give up non-essentials when necessary. This use of an unknown tongue and one now dead, so far as ordinary speech is concerned, has been held against us as a withholding from the people of a means of comprehension. But we claim that all but the most ignorant know the meaning of our offices in this so-called unknown tongue, and can follow them. Those more ignorant we instruct as far as possible. Direct preaching or instruction is always in the colloquial tongue of the worshippers, but even that, the more ignorant do not always fully understand.

"We have heard the taunt that our Church is for the ignorant and can flourish only in ignorance. It is our glory that we include as equally important for their soul's salvation, the ignorant, the poor, the lowly, shutting out none. For the benefit of ignorance we have used images as helps but not for adoration.

"Our Church is a great bulwark against unbelief. What has been counted for bigotry is but her anxiety that no one's faith should be unsettled. Even if it is wrong, worldly wisdom might say that it is safer to stay in the Church of one's fathers for no other reason than blind belief in what

[1] John S. Vaughan.

has been taught in childhood. It is easy to be led away by following human research, unguided, until irretrievably lost.

"Our Church stands for the best principles of morality. Its teachings are in the line of stability and it safeguards society. It respects the laws of sobriety and health. As examples we may instance our teachings as to the sanctity of the marriage tie. It does not hesitate to touch upon delicate subjects if necessary. Its members are taught that they should increase and multiply, not, as has been basely charged, that our numerical strength may outbalance that of our opponents, though that is perhaps one of the rewards granted for correct living, but that the laws of health and purity may not be infringed. In short all of our teaching and practice is for betterment, for comfort of mind, for purity of life, for good, not evil. There may be good Catholics who are not good Christians. That is but human. We will admit that there may be good Christians who are not good Catholics. Our friend Greatheart is an example."

"I hope our friend Romanus will include me in the same class with Greatheart." The voice was that of Militant, a former witness. "In return I may please him by testifying to my admiration for certain things in his organisation, as I have already done to some extent. His centralisation and his recognition of the authority of a single head have always appealed to me as a military man. I like obedience and discipline, thorough education for the work of an officer, and those officers not allowed to have any other business than that for which they were educated. His Church does not educate an officer and then let him find his own place for usefulness. The place is found for him and he is not commissioned unless such an officer is needed in such a place. Nor is such an officer employed unless it is known where the means are to come from for his livelihood. He is not allowed to find that livelihood for himself if he can, or starve, he and all belonging to him. He is ordered to his command in the place that best suits him

and where he is most needed, and told not only where he is to fight but how he is to fight and when. What wonder that he can fight to advantage and show results."

"Now then," said the Moderator, "let us get down to something definite. Romanus has well spoken, and others, with the exception of Protest, have expressed a willingness to live in charity with him. From this we gather that our petitioners will first of all desire a greater unity with the great branch of the Christian Church here represented by Romanus."

"God forbid!" shouted Protest. "The work of three hundred years for nought! But I forgot that I am refused further hearing."

"One moment," said Objector, "if only to maintain my reputation that my objections apply equally on either side as may be convenient. I cannot approve of the excessive claims of this Roman Church. In furtherance of those claims one of its official heads once gave away the whole country of Ireland when it was not his to give, and he asked for and went through the form of receiving the kingdom of England from a subservient king in order that he might give it back again as if by authority. The claims of the Roman Church for absolute dominion have been constantly made and as constantly denied by all other Christian people, for the last fourteen hundred years. In our own time these claims are made with less show of outward violence but with no less intensity. Rome strives as earnestly as ever for absolute mastery. The growth of liberal ideas and the world's advance forbid, it is true, the use of the old-time weapons; but the determination on the part of Rome is the same, though the means employed may be different.

"Militant may notice that Rome, like a successful commander, has altered the order of the campaign. She leaves the East for the most part alone for the present. In Germany she is content to hold her own if she can. In France she is on the defensive. She has turned her eyes to the

English-speaking countries particularly, and especially at this time to the United States of America. With the wisdom of a serpent and the harmlessness of a dove, the Church of Rome is centring her power in this country for the subjugation of Christianity in America."[1]

Then another voice was heard, one that had before, unnamed, made the comprehensive remark as to the ultimate destination of all Catholics.

"And in Catholic countries like this Ireland, a bloody papist can't even give you the decent time of day as in a Christian country. When he meets a neighbour, instead of saying 'Bon jour' or 'Good morning,' like other decent people, he says, 'God salute you.' If he sees a person at work he says, 'Prosperity from God on you.' If you are parting from him, he says, 'May God prosper you sevenfold.' If you sneeze he will cry, 'God with us.' He salutes with, 'God greet you,' and the answer is, 'God and Mary greet you.'"

"I protest," interrupted Objector, "that this is not sacrilege but because an Irishman is pious by nature. He sees the hand of God in every place, in every time, and in everything. There is not an Irishman in a hundred in whom is the making of an unbeliever. God is for him a Thing assured, true, intelligible. It is from this feeling that his ordinary expressions and salutations come."

"And it is to his credit," said Greatheart.

"But take other Catholic countries," continued the same unnamed individual. "Take a Dago. A Dago you know is an Italian, papists every one of them. Not only does he raise his hat to you and say, 'Praised be Jesus,' and expect you to raise yours and reply, 'Praised be Jesus and Mary,' but wherever you turn you are confronted with some public evidence of catholicism. He erects crosses on mountain tops that they may be seen for miles, he builds little shrines to the Virgin and Child in the most

[1] Bishop Paret.

remote as well as the most accessible places. You cannot enter a butcher's or a baker's shop without being confronted with a picture of the Madonna or some popish saint, with a lamp burning before it after dark."

"It is deplorable," commented Greatheart, "and the lamp burns in the daytime also!"

"Is that so? Well! And we spend money to convert them, much money, with little results, they are so bigoted. Religion is such an every-day affair with those fellows, in their business and family, a pure formality. They make it too cheap. And think of the danger to our free institutions, our schools, our government,—the bloody 'papes' all voting as the pope directs."

"It is hardly worth while," said Romanus, addressing his remark directly to the speaker, "to take that danger into account. Here at least it has been one of imminency for the past three centuries but has never materialised."[1]

The Moderator, with the other members of the Commission, sat unmoved during these interruptions, content that

[1] Among the loyalists the French alliance [1778] was regarded as a horror and an infamy far worse than the Declaration of Independence. That Protestant colonists should ally themselves with the great Roman Catholic monarchy, the ancient enemy of the Anglo-Saxon race, and ally themselves for the purpose of making war upon their own faithful and loving mother, England, was a depth of degradation to which, they declared, they had thought it impossible for Americans to descend. They saw in it nothing but ruin, and the Romanising of America under despotic government.

For the rest of the war, and even for some time afterwards, loyalist newspapers and writers never wearied of describing the details of this ruin which they saw so clearly appearing. They were sure that parts of America had been ceded to France by secret clauses in the treaty or would be demanded at the end of the war, and at times they named the particular states. French vessels were on their way to America laden with tons of holy water, casks of consecrated oil, chests of beads, crucifixes, consecrated wafers, mass books, and bales of indulgences, besides the wheels, hooks, and pincers of the Inquisition.—Sydney George Fisher, in *The Struggle for American Independence.* Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company.

the dispute should be settled by the contestants. When it had run its course the Moderator said:

"Then in the petitions for unity which have brought us among you, you do not all include this Church of Romanus?"

"On no account do we wish for such unity," urged Protest.

"But is this Church not Christian even if in error? Are her errors so great that you must cut off all association with her?"

"But they do not consider themselves in error," replied Protest.

"Nor do you, perhaps."

"It is hard, Sire," said Greatheart, "for many, particularly Americans, to recognise a Romanist as a Christian. Many in England are also so minded from memories of foreign usurpation of rule over those native born, which issue has been fought to a finish with suffering on both sides and a resulting settled distrust. To my mind union without Rome would be no union. Our prejudices against Rome come largely from the fact that we here see among her followers many of the more ignorant who are also the poor, who are included in our immigration from thickly settled strongholds of that faith. From that has come the taunt that Rome can make converts only among the ignorant. These outnumber the intelligent, the refined and wealthy, only because they always do in all communities. But in this Church the diverse elements sit side by side in public worship with equal rights."

Representative again asked to be heard:

"This dispute has shown one of our greatest difficulties, as to which we need your guidance as much as in trying to bring to pass the primary object of our petitions. All of my countrymen here, from want of sufficient knowledge of the religious world at large, cannot be sufficiently liberal minded to take in the whole of Christendom in our plans for reunion. Here more particularly we feel the burden

of the numberless warring sects of Protestantism, which are made up of those who, in the past, have repudiated Rome. They are particles broken from Rome. To such, union means only what will give peace at home. But shall the desired union be locally confined to our own shores, and to these fragments, or even to the Protestantism of the world?

"The Church of England, here represented, has an advantage in that it stands alone, an historical church, and yet one counted friendly by those who protested against Rome. But with or without this Church of England and her descendants, shall we, in our plans for union, leave out entirely those two great historical churches of the world, Rome and the Eastern Church? Their numbers, compared with American Protestantism, even if that were united, must make them appear to you of more importance. Unless we can overcome our hatred for Rome, a local unity without her would be but a more compact and larger unit with which to fight her as an opponent. Such a unity would leave out by far the greater part of the Christian world.

"As to the great Eastern Church, that does not so vitally affect us, for one thing on account of the distance which separates us. As we have not been so much in conflict with that Church, it is thought to be more in sympathy with us. It was separated from Rome long before our Protestants were; in fact Rome separated from it, and it was the earlier Church in many of the first beginnings and had more importance in the ancient world. Like Rome it has a line of ecclesiastical rulers continuous from the Apostles, of equal if not greater authenticity than that of Rome.

"This Church to-day stands for orthodoxy as Rome for catholicity, and it is fiercely intolerant. The chance of union between those two is very slight. The break has been of long standing and the conflicts of great bitterness, though mostly over what you would consider of little

moment.[1] Were we in union with both of these two great portions of the Church, they would not recognise each other. Without either there would be no true unity, for both are Christians, just as a unity which would include only the United States of America, and not the world, would be no unity. Christ's Church, as seen from your standpoint, from without, can set up no such little geographical barriers as would be included in the latter plan.

"Our prayer has been not only for unity, but that we may know what true unity is, that we may wish to attain it and be taught how."

"Is it the wish of any here present to be heard further in this connection?" asked the Moderator.

"Sire, you may recall me as having spoken before. My name is Encourager. My pressing duties at that time called me away, but my interest has caused me to return. I wish to suggest that whether we may or may not agree, under your guidance, as to the possible extent of a greater unity, it is well to make what progress we may. There is so much to be done towards a unification of faith and practice in each branch of the Christian Church. Harmony in any given Church is so much gain and is a prophecy of greater things to come."

Objector again spoke:

"I surely could not approve of any unity, even if it could include Rome, which would not also include the Eastern Church, Rome's greatest opponent. It has been truly said that without either there could be no unity. It would be but the unity of a small fraction. But I do not think that Rome will ever recognise the East. For a thousand years she has called her great Eastern rivals heretics. Yet she herself could be counted heretical. Rome claims that all her definitions of dogma since the Church began have been by authority of general councils of the

[1] The points of difference included not only the Filioque but the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, the use of images, the position of the hands in priestly benediction, and the like.

Church, which but showed the crystallised form of belief, later officially promulgated by the head of the Church. But these councils have been less representative of the whole Christian body as time advanced. By them Rome has gradually added to original doctrine. If a full council could be convened to-day, representative of all on earth who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of men, including Eastern, Western, Anglican, and Protestant Churches, the Church of Rome, large as it is, would be condemned by a large majority as herself schismatical and also heretical. And it is to be noticed that all of these false doctrines, which have thus been added, have been so added on account of the claims of the papacy for precedence, universal sovereignty, and infallibility. Remove this cause and the whole trouble ceases. Take away this head——"

"And you become a dead body,—a body without life," added Romanus, who had been an attentive listener.

"I have something to say," said a new witness.

"Your name, Friend," demanded the Moderator.

"My name is Luthrem. I belong to a church which came directly from Rome by schism on account of her errors."

"Did not one of your fellows meet us in the Eternal City?"

"It is probable, for that is near our birthplace, in Germany."

"What have you to say?"

"I would wish to be heard later in my own right on the claims of our Church as a church, and not as now only as an unalterable opponent of the Church of Rome, as she is of us. I wish to add weight to one statement of that unnamed and erratic person who opposed Rome. He mentioned the menace to our institutions of free government which would be most imminent were Rome to have unlimited power. In politics we, as Church members, do not usually consider religious belief, of Jew even, or Gentile. But when we find a loyal and devoted member of the

Roman Catholic Church a candidate for an office of government, the case is different. Then we must consider the principles of his Church in relation to the State, and to freedom of conscience and of worship. We are not at a loss to know the exact spirit of the Church of Rome and her principles on those important points. They have been declared and reiterated by the recognised rulers of that Church, the Bishops of Rome, in language which admits of no possible misunderstanding or misinterpretation."[1]

[1] The famous Bull, "Unam Sanctum," of Pope Boniface VIII., A.D. 1302, distinctly claims that all power, both secular and spiritual, is given to the Church (Uterque gladius in potestate ecclesiæ, spiritualis et materialis). That the temporal power (of the State) must be subject to the spiritual power of the Church (Temporalem autoritatem spirituali subjici potestati). It is laid down as an absolute condition of salvation for every human creature that it must be subject to the Roman Pontiff (Subsees Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus et pronuntiamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis), this submission including secular affairs as well as spiritual.

In his Encyclical Letter of August 15, 1854, Pope Pius IX. declares: "The absurd and erroneous doctrines or ravings in defence of liberty of conscience are a most pestilential error—a pest of all others most to be dreaded in a State."

The same ruler of the Roman Catholic Church in his Encyclical of December 8, 1864, condemns those who hold that "the State should have no power to inflict certain fixed penalties on those who offend against the Catholic religion." He also condemns those who hold "that liberty of conscience is the inherent right of every man."

Also those who hold that "any citizen has the right to express publicly by speech or print whatever he thinks, and that neither ecclesiastical nor secular authorities should have the right to limit such liberty."

This Encyclical of December, 1864, culminates in a syllabus which, among eighty different statements or opinions, condemns the following:

"No. 15. Every man is at liberty to accept that religion, which in the light of his reason, seems to him the true one." Condemned by the syllabus.

"No. 24. That the Church has no secular power, directly or indirectly, and that she ought not to employ force." Condemned by the syllabus.

"No. 45. That to the State belongs the supervision and direction of the public schools." Condemned by the syllabus.

"We have now heard," said the Moderator, "both those who do and do not desire that the unity for which they have asked should include the Church of Rome, both of these classes of witnesses not belonging to Rome. Now we should like to ask our friend Romanus himself whether he wishes a unity with those who oppose him and if so what he would be willing to concede in order to bring it about."

"God knows, Sire," replied Romanus, "that such a unity is the dearest wish of my heart."

"And what would you give up?"

"God is my witness, Sire, believing what I do, I can concede nothing. We claim Divine right and it is not for me to question."

"How then shall we come by this unity?"

"By those who are wrong acknowledging their errors and coming into the one only Church which has any kind of an effective organisation, a directing head, or a catholicity which can at all be considered such."

"There you are," the unnamed individual was heard to exclaim. "That shows where you are at. You are up against it. You 're at a stone wall if you include the 'papes,' and I 'm glad of it!"

"And is there no such thing among mortals as Christian

"No. 55. That the Church is to be separate from the State and the State separate from the Church." Condemned by the syllabus.

"No. 77. That it was no longer required in our times that the Catholic religion should be maintained as the only State religion, to the exclusion of all other cults." Condemned by the syllabus.

Such are the official declarations of the Church of Rome, affirmed and reaffirmed by its mouthpiece, the Bishop of Rome, the principles which every loyal and devout Roman Catholic is bound to believe, hold, and enforce under penalty of losing his soul—due allowance, of course, being made for the suspension of their actual enforcement at certain times and places when it would be inexpedient or impossible. (Temporum ratione habita.)

From a Letter to President Roosevelt from four Lutheran Clergymen belonging to the jurisdiction of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, dated Nov. 18, 1908.

forbearance?" It was Charity who spoke and his tones were mournful in the extreme.

Encourager here rose to speak:

"Words fail me, Sire, to——"

ETA

England to the Rescue

WORDS did indeed fail not only Encourager but Greatheart also. The members of the Commission, including its head, spoke not, and there was a silence in the vast assembly, which became more and more painful as it continued.

At length Encourager again spoke:

"Things may not be so bad as they seem. I am sure that there is a way out of our difficulty. When lost one tries to find where he is. If we come against a stone wall, as our picturesque friend has said, at the end of a blind passage, we retrace our steps and try another in the search for a suitable outlet. There is a brother here who has the plan of a different route. Would it please you to call my friend, Anglic?"

"Let us hear Anglic," ruled the Moderator.

A man of dignified bearing and genial face arose, one apparently intellectual and scholarly who was not unlike a witness who had testified informally in the Eternal City, he who had asked that the land of his birth might be visited. He said:

"With due respect to our Celestial visitants, I would urge the claims of the Church of my fathers, already mentioned, as the *via media* in which all who would, might possibly walk without losing their individual identity. This Church, as here developed, is the offspring of one first established in another land, England, which country, though

small in extent, is the centre of a mighty present empire, on which the sun never sets. Wherever this empire governs, there is found this Church. In connection with her daughter in America this Church maintains a foothold wherever the English tongue is spoken, and that girdles the world. That is the language destined to become the universal solvent of mankind and to be the means of taking away the curse inflicted for disobedience at the Tower of Babel. It is a great church, not so great in numbers as that of my friend Romanus, nor as the Eastern Church, but of commanding influence and a church whose opinions are held in great respect by thinking men. This Church has organisation. It is not narrowly intolerant, not requiring that all of its members should think alike in order to retain membership. This is its greatest advantage. It is exceptionally situated as a rallying point, as it occupies a middle ground between great extremes, those of Rome on the one hand and of Protestantism on the other. With the great Eastern Church it is on terms of peace and increasing amity, though little understood as yet by the members of that communion. Though seemingly so now, it is not at all impossible, for reasons which I will give, that its claims may be recognised more and more in the future by the Church of Rome.

"If it can come to some working agreement with these two bodies, the three would by far outnumber all the remainder of Christendom. But such a coalition would omit the Protestantism of this land, and that, were it united, would be a great body of commanding influence, which would greatly outnumber those of my faith who are here resident, though we have influence and wealth, and are held in general respect.

"Such an omission would leave out many of those who have asked for this inquiry as a relief from intolerable conditions due to the numberless fragments into which the Church is here divided.

"But with this Protestant mass here gathered, our

Church is at peace, with growing good-will and fellowship, in fact we are usually counted a part of it, though not from any overt act of ours. The general belief is that we oppose Rome, which we do, at least so far as to reject her claims for supremacy. We do not recognise the modern claims of the Bishop of Rome nor indeed do we count ourselves under obligation to concede to him even that primacy of rank which the general councils of the Early Church gave him, not of Divine right but because of the imperial character of his See, a thing that no longer exists. We admit that he has as much authority in our Church as any other bishop of the universal Church may have, and no more.

"Our Church is an early Christian Church. Its claims, as I understand, have already been set before you. It is in direct, unbroken connection with the Church of Christ, and not only through the Early Church at Rome,[1] hence it is part of the one great holy Catholic Church. Though

[1] Let us see when the Church was established in Britain. Clement (mentioned Phil. iv., 3) who was a contemporary of the Apostles says, "The Apostle Paul published righteousness through the whole world and went to the utmost bounds of the west, including Gaul, Spain, and the British Isles." Eusebius, the first great Church historian, says, "Some of the Apostles passed over the ocean to the British Isles." From Lingard, an honourable and erudite Romish historian, the same fact may be proven, that the Church was planted in Great Britain by the Apostles and remained entirely independent of Rome until 596. At that time Augustine was sent by the pope to convert that island from paganism, but when he landed there he found Christianity in successful operation. Lingard says the queen was a Christian, and when a council was called to meet Augustine, seven bishops and many most learned men appeared. Two hundred years before the landing of Augustine a synod of British Christians assembled to check the heresy of Pelagius. This same historian, Lingard, says the British Christians suffered by the persecution of Diocletian, A.D. 300. He also acknowledges the statement of Theodoret, that the Apostles planted the Church in Great Britain, to be true. Thus we have reliable authority to prove that Christianity existed in Britain in substantial purity from the earliest times until A.D. 596, when Augustine came there, and was informed that the Pope had no jurisdiction over the Church in Britain.—*Isaac M. Frey.*

See also Appendix II. "The Beginnings of English Christianity."

our claims have been disputed by Rome, we have an unbroken line of ecclesiastical rulers from the Apostles of our Lord and we can, I assure you, make our claims good. It is possible that these claims, in the course of time, and with the growth of Christian fellowship under the guidance of you and your associates, might be recognised not only by Rome, but by that other great Christian body in the East. Both of these require this unbroken line as a requisite of an authorised Christian Church. Even if what others might consider imperfections were found to exist, they might be perfected. This continuity of the line of ecclesiastical rulers from early sources, being firmly held by these three great organisations, is thus the requirement of an overwhelming majority of the Christian world, though counted as unimportant by a majority of those here present.

"That my ideas of possible unity are not so impossible as some suppose, at least in so far as the great Roman Church is concerned, was conceded over one hundred years ago by one of its own writers."[1]

"Permit me to say a word." The request came from Romanus and it was granted by the Moderator.

"My brother here, Anglic, whom I respect greatly and love as much as I can one not of my own Church, claims to be Catholic. He refuses me that title unless it is qualified as Roman, and in return I must necessarily protest that he has it not of right. I belong to a church which is truly Catholic and which outnumbers his in a ratio of at least three to one. Our Catholic Church and its infallible head

[1] If ever Christians unite, as all things make it their interest to do, it would seem that the movement must come from the Church of England. We [*i.e.*, the Roman Catholics] are too far removed from the sectarians, and there are no means by which they may comprehend us; but the Church of England which touches us with one hand, touches with the other a class we cannot reach. And although she may, in a certain point of view, on this account, be made the butt of both parties, yet in other respects she is most precious, and may be regarded as resembling those chemical *intermedes* which are capable of bringing into unity elements the most discordant.—*De Maistre.*

say that he is not Catholic, and who has a better right to say who are of our fold than we ourselves?" [1]

"If the brother means," resumed Anglic, "that I am not a member of that part of the universal Church of Christ on earth to which he belongs, the portion which confesses allegiance to his supreme ruler in Rome, and which he claims is the Catholic Church, I grant his contention. But that is not the Catholic Church I mean. If he claims that his Church is the only Catholic Church, or more properly that those outside of it have no right to be part of the greater Catholic Church, I combat his claims and insist that he represents but a portion. If that is not so, what becomes of our Eastern brethren, who with ourselves claim to be a part of the universal Church? Neither of us is Catholic by his finding, though together we may possibly outnumber his Church of Rome. Are we not a large portion

[1] This is a feature of the discussion that at first exasperates. They [the Anglicans in the United States of America] claim to be Catholic already. We say they are not. They say they know better, that they are at one with the Church of the past. We say they are not united with the Church of the past or the present. Now, this, I say is a perplexing, almost a ludicrous, position for all parties. They who make these claims rising up in an admittedly heretical body, still subjecting themselves, in so far as they are subject to any power, to its obedience, are technically called Protestant Episcopal, yet claim they are not Protestant but Catholic, and they number perhaps a million. Yet 300,000,000 say that they belong not to the Catholic communion. Nay, worse; not only does the body of Catholic Christendom reject them, but the infallible head thereof rejects them.

Now, if there is any power inherent in a society, necessary in fact to its very existence, it is the power inherent in it of determining who are its members and who are not. If you deny it that power, if it no longer can set around itself delimitation, if it have no rules of membership, or if it have no power to enforce the rules it makes, thence at once it ceases to be a society; it becomes a mob. The Catholic Church, an organised society, endowed with a divine commission, with an authority so clearly evident, with a history wherein even in a human way vast experience must have been gained, is perhaps of all other societies most competent to declare who are of her fold.—*Archbishop John J. Glennon*, St. Louis.

of some Christian Church, and of importance, at least in numbers?"

"But, Sire," objected Romanus, "Anglic's claims for catholicity include a claim for antiquity, and the fact is that his Church did not exist as a church separate from Rome until fifteen centuries after our Church was formed. His Church was founded, for personal reasons, by one of the English monarchs, not more than four hundred years ago."

"Sire!" replied Anglic, "the assertion that the English ruler who is classed as the Eighth Henry was the founder of the Church of England, our Mother in the faith, is to us an amusing thing and at the same time it irritates. But it is more galling to think that, on account of the little knowledge of Church history possessed by some of our members, such a statement is accepted by them as if true. Rome knows how to hurl that charge at us with great effect, trusting that by reason of this ignorance, the wrongful claim will not be refuted.

"When the first missionary from Rome, by name Augustine, first arrived in England to convert those who were heathen, he found an early Christian Church, which had been in existence for over six hundred years,[1] and which would have nothing to do with the Roman intruders. This Church maintained its services and ministrations in the native tongue. By a variety of means, Rome by small degrees secured a foothold, but against the solemn protest of the ancient Church, her independence having been frequently asserted. It required more than a century for Rome to make any headway, and all through the dark, weary centuries which followed, there was frequent and violent opposition to the Roman yoke of spiritual despotism.[2]

[1] See Appendix III. "The Early Anglican Church."

[2] About the time of Pope Alexander II., A.D. 1061–1073, the Church had become very nearly subjected to this Romish usurpation, but from the time of the Norman Conquest there were frequent strong and positive

"In the struggles with Rome, by which finally Rome as ruler was driven from the land where she did not belong, there were engendered great feelings of uncharitableness. With this defeat in view Rome would consider England a great prize could she regain her former position. She will not acknowledge the claims of Anglicanism because of it she is most afraid, and she classes us with Protestants in order to belittle these claims.

"In one sense of the word as used in our language, we will admit that we are Protestant in that we protest or declare what our belief is. But in the sense of officially protesting, as have our brethren, some against one form of error in Rome, some against another, we cannot be called Protestant. As to our beliefs, we hold with Rome the same

---

protests from time to time, and it is certain that the British Christians never willingly and patiently endured the Romish yoke.

In the year 1237 Matthew Paris, a monk of St. Albans, speaks thus of the condition of England under the power of the Roman dominion: "Complaints break out and groans multiply, many crying with bloody sighs, 'it is better for us to die than to see the misery of our nation and of holy persons.' Woe to England which was once the princess of provinces, the mistress of nations, the mirror of the church, a pattern of religion, but is now become tributary."

At the same time the Bishop of Lincoln called the Pope "Antichrist and Murderer of Souls," saying the English Church is in Egyptian bondage. In 1236 the "Statute of Merton" asserted that the decrees of Rome have no force in England. The "Statute of Carlisle" in 1305, declares that the "holy Church of England was founded in the estate of prelacy within the realm of England, and that the encroachments of the Bishop of Rome tended to the annullation of the state of the Church." The "Articles of the Clergy," passed by the Ninth Parliament of Edward II., declared that "elections of the bishops shall be free to the clergy without papal interference or nomination." The "Constitutions of Clarendon," 1164, declare, "If any man be found bringing in the Pope's letter or mandate, let him be apprehended and let justice pass upon him without delay as a traitor to the king and kingdom." From the year 596 to the time of the Reformation there was no period in which the British Church was satisfied with the Romish usurpation.

But the question is asked: Did not England adopt the Roman Catholic religion? We reply: The yoke of Rome was fastened upon her neck against her will by a variety of influences, but the yoke was

creeds and admit that she administers the true sacraments of the Church, notwithstanding the superstitions with which she has obscured them. There are also some doctrines, not of faith, in respect of which we are agreed, others in which we disagree, and still others which the Roman Church either teaches or anathematises, but concerning which our Church has pronounced no judgment, and which her ministers and members are therefore free either to accept or reject."

"Yes," said Romanus, "and that touches the very weakness of my friend's Church. This glorious liberty is the source of error. There is no infallible head, in fact no head at all, to define doctrine. Each member, whether competent or not, is allowed to interpret or translate the Divine

---

borne under protest from first to last, and as soon as opportunity offered it was broken and cast away. Is your wife less loyal to you when robbers break through your house, binding her hands and feet and violating her person, than she is when you sit in quiet and peaceful security with her?

This is just what Rome did to the Bride of Christ in Britain. The British Church was subjugated only after repeated trials, and submitted to superior power, and she maintained that protest until an opportunity offered for throwing off Papal authority.

When Henry VIII. severed the relations that had arbitrarily existed between Rome and England, on account of the affront he had received from the Pope in the refusal to sanction the contemplated divorce from his wife, the Church considered that an opportune period to inaugurate the reformation so long desired. The subject was discussed in the universities, among the learned and among all classes, whether the supremacy of Rome should any longer be tolerated, and in 1534 Cranmer put the question to both Houses of Convocation against the Pope's supremacy. The Church in England, though under the iron heel of Rome for centuries, was ready for salvation from that oppression as soon as the opportunity was presented. It was declared free and independent from the oppressors who had held it in bondage for more than 500 years; and it at once proceeded to a reformation of all the errors and abuses which during that time had been imposed upon it. No changes were made in the constitution and organisation of the Church, except merely the removal of the Papal authority, and the abuses dependent upon it.—*Isaac M. Frey.*

Word for himself and in accordance with his own belief. How can this but produce error and heresy?"

"Is it not better," replied Anglic, "to shelter all shades of belief under a Christian charity, in one Church, rather than to expel those of different minds because they will not believe as directed by one master mind, unless indeed that mind is of Christ Himself? By so doing you arrogate to yourselves the powers of God. It is the theory of the Church of my friend, Romanus, that its members should be led as a little child, as one ignorant, but the time has come when the child has grown and will think for himself, and not always as others, as God has not given us minds of similar bent.

"We are a reformed church, but a church reformed within itself, without, as already claimed, breaking our unity with the Early Church. To a lesser extent the Roman Church is now also reformed from the more corrupt Roman Church of the past. But there is one great difference between the Reformation in England and the Protestant Reformation elsewhere. England only adopted that measure of reform which is compatible with the unity of Christendom. Elsewhere was adopted what, if fully conformed to in its original ultra form, would make the unity of Christendom impossible.

"The time of our troubles in England was a corrupt age, when the Church was corrupt and the rulers degenerate. The trouble came from the effort to remedy a corruption which is now largely eliminated. In England now, outside of controlling the nation's government, the Church of Rome is in the enjoyment of as free a toleration and has there as much opportunity to increase in numbers as in her native home or in this free land. In England to-day, under a so-called Protestant government, the Church of Rome has a hierarchy, numerous buildings, great wealth, and numbers. She is treated with Christian fellowship, she has the protection of law, and her rites and ceremonies are not only permitted but respected.

"But I cannot properly explain our present position, nor can you, Sire, suggest the proper remedy, unless I touch briefly on the past, if you will so allow. But such reference will be on historical lines only and such as you have already once permitted, hence my request."

"If you think it necessary to the understanding of the subject you have our permission to proceed."

"Then, Sire, if you will permit me also to use the terms which will more readily be understood by my human hearers, I will briefly say that the period when England was most under the Roman yoke, in about our year of Christ 1533, was immediately followed, within an interval of twenty-five years, by a period in which that country was most violently opposed to Rome. There had been previous reformers, but the sudden final change was not their work but that of the nation, and was due entirely to the folly of Rome itself. The English reformers differed from those elsewhere in that they planned to reform the Church as a Catholic Church, by a gradual change, so as not violently to drive out any, but hold them in the church of their baptism, infancy, and education by tolerating many things not considered essential, which might afterwards pass away and be forgotten. These things had crept into our Church partly through the influence of scholastic divines, partly through the superstitions of ignorant preachers, partly through the corruption of avaricious ecclesiastics, without express sanction, yet without rebuke, though often with the encouragement of the Roman authorities. Some of these were erroneous opinions held almost as doctrines, though unauthorised by the universal Church or by Scripture; others were practices counted superstitious, or were entire innovations.

"One reformer elsewhere was enunciating a doctrine, novel at the time, which he called 'Justification by faith alone,' which I shall describe as one-sided, a half truth, true or false according to the sense in which it was taken or modified by qualifications. In England which had more

national feeling than any other country at the time, it pleased English pride when the ruler, this same Henry, on behalf of the Roman Church, condemned this doctrine. But when, for his own selfish reasons on the question of his marriage, Henry came to be in opposition to the pope, the evasions of the latter but inspired contempt for him and his office. Then it was recalled that a pope had cursed and excommunicated the authors of a document, called the Great Charter, which was regarded as most important to the liberties of the great nation, and that another, the Third Innocent, had attempted to make an English sovereign his vassal. There were many English laws denying papal pretensions and denying unequivocally that the papacy had rights on English soil. Therefore, though the selfishness of the monarch's course was apparent, it was thought but right that he should at least hold the English Church competent to rule on the validity of English marriages. When it was proclaimed by King and Parliament that the Bishop of Rome had no more right in England than any other bishop, it was not thought a new doctrine. In this then was the difference between English reform and reform elsewhere, in that in England Roman authority was repudiated without, at that time, change in doctrine.[1]

"The Holy Scriptures had for some time been printed in English and circulated when, during the minority of the ruler in the following reign, certain reforms began which included public worship in the vernacular instead of the language of Rome, though the form was substantially unchanged except by the elimination of certain superfluities. It was hoped to change false doctrine slowly by moral suasion. But within a few months of the formulation of certain defining statements, a new ruler, Mary, came to the throne, who, under foreign influence, soon showed a leaning toward foreign ecclesiastical authority. The Eng-

[1] See Appendix IV. "The Independence of the Church of England."

lish love of conservatism, or dislike of change, supported her for a time, and a Roman representative[1] received distinguished honour. Rather than favour a change from the habits of their fathers, the people were apparently willing to waive their dislikes.

"The recognition of foreign jurisdiction, even through a native born representative, was not agreeable and in addition the prevailing system of communities of celibate clergy had never quite commended itself to the English mind. Notwithstanding Roman edicts, respected English clergy lived openly and honourably with their families.

"The enormous wealth, gradually accumulated, possessed by the monastic establishments, was the cause of great dissatisfaction on the part of the nobles, to whom much of it rightly belonged, and the luxury of the monks, many of them not Englishmen, was resented by the poor. In the time of Henry there were still monasteries inculcating learning, charity, and purity, but in probably the majority instead of austerity and piety there were pride and self-indulgence, if not positive licentiousness. Hence when Henry began a robbery of these estates for his own benefit and that of his followers, it was approved by rich and poor.

"Under Mary there was no strong desire to return to the spiritual subjection to Rome. A national dignity, often outraged, prevented. Besides, those who had acquired riches in the sale of the monasteries feared lest they should be deprived of them. The poor also disapproved. Public sentiment was largely influenced by needless violence to popular prejudice on the part of the reformers. What most keenly and dangerously wounded the natural sense of reverence, when the country was being governed by reforming nobles after the death of Henry, preceding the majority of the new King, was an order to demolish the beautiful stone altars in churches and substitute unseemly wooden tables for the celebration of the Eucharist. The

[1] Cardinal Pole.

detestation of this order was augmented by the manner of its enforcement, often with sacrilegious ribaldry. Moderate reformers were horrified by this wilful profanation and there was a violent reaction. Even superstition was thought better than sacrilege. These were the mixed sentiments when Mary began to rule, unrest under changes, but no desire for papal supremacy.

"But withal, under trials, there had been a growing belief in the rights of conscience, and old ceremonies when restored seemed less pleasing.

"The scale was turned in public sentiment when the Queen contracted a marriage with a foreigner, who was representative of the most narrow-minded fanatical Roman belief. Under his guidance the Queen permitted and authorised persecutions to establish the foreign Church, governed by her desire to retain the love of her unworthy husband. The burning of human beings began. Men, women, and even children were burned to death for continuing to believe what the law had made them free to believe only a few short months before. A counter reaction set in. As has been said by another, every death won hundreds to the cause of the victims. Said a contemporary: 'The hearts of twenty thousand rank papists have been lost to the faith within twelve months.' The ecclesiastical officials charged by the Queen with the prosecution of the horrible business were unwilling and lagged, when the Queen imperatively urged them to further efforts. In three months fifty more victims were hurried to their doom, which number included al of the most prominent prelates who had been active in reformation in the former reign. From one of these who had been of most high rank,[1] but then an enfeebled old man, the torturers wrung a recantation, but proceeded with the execution. This implacable cruelty terrified all England. A crowning horror came to pass when an English child was born at the stake to which its

[1] Cranmer.

mother was chained and went to God with no other baptism than the baptism of fire in which the hapless pair perished together. Then England was in furious opposition. Could a system which could approve such things be representative of Jesus Christ? On the face of it, surely not. It was the age of the bloody Inquisition, which had reached its greatest development in Romish Spain, the country of the Queen's husband. There, under one Torquemada, seventy thousand human beings had been burned to death. A Spanish general[1] boasted that he had sent eighteen thousand men and women to death by the executioner. Then one who had been the soul of the Inquisition was elected pope.[2] The true representative of the Roman Church at that time was not its hierarchy but this Inquisition. How could it be holy or Apostolic?

"After Mary, another Queen—Elizabeth—reigned, who had personal ambitions to serve, who probably cared little for religion, to whom the Church and Church doctrine were of little importance except for political ends, who liked gorgeous ceremonial and disliked a married clergy. She might have preferred concord with Rome as bringing her in closer touch with other sovereigns of Europe but it was the people she had to deal with, whose opinions she had to respect. For thirty years after her accession, England heard across the seas the crackling of the flames in which men perished for their faith. English sailors thrown upon those treacherous shores were burned, not only for heresy, but for such trifles as even owning an English Bible. On the north the nation was threatened with war by the pretensions of another Queen who was backed by Rome. French diplomacy, also backed by Rome, taxed the vigilance of the nation. A pope pretended to excommunicate Elizabeth, deprive her of her crown, and attempted to assail her name and fame. Then came a most powerful Spanish fleet to conquer England, bearing the cross as an

[1] Alva. [2] Pius V.

emblem, for the failure of which, as Englishmen believe, God Himself interfered.

"Then who were England's friends? Protestants in France, Switzerland, Holland, Germany, Norway, and Sweden. The name Protestant became dear to England. England was willing to be called a Protestant nation, but the Church of England never consented to be called a Protestant Church and on one famous occasion stoutly refused to accept or submit to that designation.[1]

[1] If these things were understood a little better than they are, it might be reasonable and desirable that our American Church should drop the designation of Protestant, which has been attached to its legal name. We do not pretend to love that name. It recalls a bad time in our history, a time of horrible distress, a time of bitterness and anger and war. We have outlived that time and some of its confusions. —*The Church Standard.*

We must confess to a certain weariness of word-juggling in connection with the word *Protestant.* In its original and historical sense it is a word in which the Anglican Church has no interest. It began with a protest by certain Germans at the Diet of Spires against the adoption of two objectionable resolutions by that body, and the protesting party appealed from the Diet to the supreme authority of a General Council of the Church. It was a noble and most catholic act, and it is one of the ironies of history that a name which was thus originated should have come, in process of time, to signify, as it does to many minds, a person who rejects the authority of the Catholic Church.

In the tumultuous period of the Reformation, all who protested for any reason whatsoever against the corrupt doctrines, the evil practices, or the enormous usurpations of the See of Rome, were called Protestants; and even the Church of England has been so described in acts of Parliament. But the name was never adopted by the American Church, nor by any part of the Church, until a convention of Churchmen in Maryland, at the time of the American Revolution, chose to describe itself as a convention of the "Protestant Episcopal Church," the former adjective being used to correct a prevalent opinion that the doctrine of the Church differs but little from Romanism, and the latter to describe that feature in her system of government in which she chiefly differs from the Protestant denominations in this country. The adoption of the name was natural enough; we do not pretend to think that it was either wise or fortunate. Historically and etymologically the word reeks of controversy and breathes the spirit of division. If the Church were at bottom Protestant she would be essentially schismatic. At bottom

"The worship of this our Mother Church, with all others still in communion with her, still remains substantially that of the first English form, which came from the earlier liturgies, not only from that of Rome, though with us Rome inherits many of the early Christian forms. The Catholic faith is still held in its simplicity, and Christian liberty is still maintained in its integrity, by the Church of England, but she has never become a Protestant sect. She was and still remains a national Catholic Church.[1]

"I can see, Sire, by the face of my much loved friend, Romanus, that I have pained him by this recital. I wished not to do so, but how else could I show how we came to occupy the position we hold to-day? I meant not to offend the Church he loves. He may truly say that the opponents of Rome exercised like intolerance whenever they had sufficient power and opportunity. On that account your ruling is kindly, that a consideration of the past is usually unnecessary. It is what we now are that is important. One of the members of the Church of Romanus has excusingly remarked that deeds, such as I have mentioned, belong to a corrupt age, when all Christendom was corrupt with its rulers, and the things which have come to pass are punishments for the iniquity.[2] On our side, a hatred of

---

our Church is Catholic, holding the Catholic faith, maintaining the Catholic order, celebrating the Catholic rites, conceding Catholic privileges to all Catholic Christians, and not only permitting but imperatively requiring her members and her ministers to hold and teach and do whatever the Catholic Church requires. The local name of Protestant Episcopal which she bears in this country is not essential nor fundamental; it is merely accidental. But whether accidental or providential, or both, the main point is the present meaning of it.—*The Church Standard.*

[1] After John Fulton.

[2] The following is from "How England became Protestant," by Francis W. Grey in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia. Published under the direction of Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D.D. Associate Editors, Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. F. Loughlin, D. D., and Rt. Rev. Mgr. James P. Turner, D.D., V.G.

The revolt of England from the Divine authority of the Holy See was part of a general movement, affecting many nations and countries. . . .

papal pretensions does not now include a personal hatred of a modern pope, nor hinder a willing recognition of the graces which adorn the lives of many of his subjects, and his own life also."

At this point Romanus spoke:

"As I have again been mentioned, I wish to speak, if only to thank the witness for the courtesy of his final remarks. But I wish to say also that I must have become a Protestant for I wish to protest, in both senses of the word, first against certain statements which he has made, and to protest on behalf of my Church that it is the only One, true and universal Church, if for no other reason, because it has but the one head and that one divinely appointed and infallible. Without that there can be no unity. Without such a head,

---

Among the ultimate remoter causes, the most important was, unquestionably, the state of Christendom in the century preceding the Reformation. The rival claims, the intrigues, excommunications, and counter-excommunications of two, and sometimes three, aspirants to the Chair of Peter, the assertion by a General Council of jurisdiction over the Vicar of Christ, of the members over the head, tended inevitably to lower the dignity of the papacy in the eyes of a wondering and distracted Christendom. How could an office be of Divine appointment concerning which none knew who was the rightful holder of it? How could it be Divine in the persons of some who exercised it?

To this primary source of all the evils that were soon to fall on the Church must be added the laxity of morals which affected clergy and laity alike, bringing religion itself into contempt. Indeed, I would almost venture to say that the degradation of the papacy was as much an effect of this condition as a cause of it. If it be true, as Carlyle says, that men always have the rulers they deserve, is it not true of the Church, as consisting of ordinary men and women? . . .

How account for all that occurred? God's chastisements, it is true, fall no less heavily on those He loves, as on His enemies; often, so far as we can see, even more heavily. . . .

It is well, then, that we should take for granted the conditions described as affecting the Church immediately prior to the Reformation, since the very summoning of the Council of Trent shows how clearly the Church recognised the need of real reform. When, therefore, men prized orthodoxy of profession over personal piety or purity of life, the decay of faith followed, as surely and as inevitably as night follows day. If the thirteenth century was, indeed, the greatest age of the

who is there to define what doctrine is true and what is false, who to enforce obedience to authority by discipline, who to authoritatively interpret Holy Scripture, or who even to say if a man-made translation of Scripture is authentic? Without this governing head there is a liberty of individuals which becomes license and produces false doctrine and the innumerable schismatic fragments through the countless diversities of beliefs of individual minds.

Church, the fourteenth certainly witnessed her utmost degradation. Her losses in the fifteenth and sixteenth were but her purging, "so as by fire," whence she has arisen purified, humbled, yet strengthened, with a promise of even greater glory than of old.

These two causes, the decay of morals and the degradation of the papacy, were common to the Reformation movement as a whole. They were the sources whence it sprang; which made it spiritually possible. A corrupt, unchaste priesthood, a relaxed monasticism, a temporal papacy, striving and striven for like any earthly monarchy, what better charges could the ingenuity of Satan himself have devised to lead weak, doubting souls to believe that Christ's promise to His Church had come to naught, and that the gates of Hell had prevailed against her? When the shepherds turned to hirelings, what would the sheep do, but wander and be scattered? . . .

Let our opinion of the leaders in this great revolt against the divinely constituted authority of the Church be what it may, there can be no doubt as to the sincerity of large numbers of their followers. . . . Men had lost all faith in the Church, all respect for clergy. Belief throughout Christendom had been so long divorced from conduct, in popes, in bishops, in the great and powerful, that men turned in sheer despair to a message which spoke of better things. . . .

The mistakes of Mary's policy are not so much the persecutions, which only began after her marriage, but the marriage itself to which may be traced the subsequent revolt of the English nation against a religion which had become identified with the most justly hated of foreign tyrants, Philip of Spain. . . .

If there is anything clear in the diplomatic correspondence of the day, now at our disposal, it is that Philip's sole idea in attacking England was his own personal advantage, and that religion was made a cloak for malice.

Elizabeth, in whose reign England became definitely a Protestant nation, had certainly no cause to love the Catholic religion as represented by a political pope, and by her brother-in-law, Philip of Spain.

Were my brother to acknowledge the Divine authority of our infallible head, his troubles would be over."

"My brother Romanus speaks truth," replied Anglic. "The belief in the Divine infallible primacy of the head of his Church is indeed the corner-stone on which its structure rests. If he takes that away the whole building falls. But I cannot acknowledge the claims made by the Bishop of Rome, for a jurisdiction over all the bishops of Christendom. They have never been acknowledged by the Eastern Church nor by the Church of England before it was robbed of its birthright by a Roman mastership of the world. Julius Cæsar was the real founder of the papacy. After these centuries of effort for control in England, what a splendid prize it would be if a successor of the Cæsars could obtain dominion over such an Empire. What gigantic power and prestige would be that of the papacy if England were again in subjection! Hence all the arts of diplomacy and politics must needs be used to win such a prize.

"If I were to acknowledge the primacy of the papacy, our troubles with Romanus would indeed be over, so far as difference with him is concerned, but what would then become of the glorious liberty of my Church which is the most brilliant jewel in its starry crown? Can a Catholic Church be exclusive? I maintain that men of diverse mould, if they think at all, cannot all be made to think alike. We glory in the fact that without surrendering essentials, we can shelter under one roof so many people, entirely dissimilar. The Anglican Church holds an impregnable position. In Catholicity, in true Christian liberty, secured by Catholic order, unbroken in its continuity, in noble orthodoxy of faith, unobscured by un-Catholic or anti-Catholic accretion, unmutilated by destructive cuttings-off, in complete and majestic fulness, yet simplicity of reverent worship, and in the glorious fruits of all these which are the end and purpose and meaning of Christianity itself, in lofty morality and Christian character, collectively and individually, it can challenge comparison with any other, nor

dread comparison in the slightest. By their fruits ye shall know them. Is Italy, are Spain and Portugal and Austria, Cuba, Mexico, and South America so vastly superior in moral tone and Christian character to the United States and England, that the Anglican Church needs to surrender her dignity and her liberty and her very principles, and become merged into that Church which is responsible for the moral and religious character of those nations?[1]

"In one particular I agree with Romanus, as to the power of the head of his Church. With one stroke of the pen he could unite Christendom. If he were to decree infallibly that he was fallible outside of his own connection, it would be done. There is such a thing as minimising differences and seeking points of contact, and sinking smaller distinctions in the united acknowledgment of great foundation truths. Also it is possible to stereotype differences which might have been transient, to deepen lines of separation, to exaggerate the importance of controversial distinctions. My Church has shrunk from needless definitions. Retaining essentials, she has given wide liberty in details. My friend says that she is too broad, too comprehensive, too tolerant, too capable of being made a common house and resting-place for the motley multitude of weary, heavy-laden souls. If these be faults, one may well believe that they will be gently regarded by Him who said, 'Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy-laden and I will give you rest.' In a time which emphasises differences there is more reason to try to bring together those who can be brought together, to eliminate the points of difference, and to search for broad grounds of agreement."[2]

"But," replied Romanus, "my brother Anglic has seen fit to make certain statements in his historical review concerning a certain English Queen of Catholic belief who sent many to the stake. While the facts are admitted, they should be attributed not so much to the accident of the

[1] O. T. Porcher. [2] Harvey Goodwin, Bishop of Carlisle.

faith of the ruling Queen as considered a question of national preservation against the encroachments of the nation represented by her foreign husband. Previous to Mary's reign, in that barbarous time, her father, the Eighth Henry, had put to death over seven thousand people, mostly for religion. Her half-sister, and successor, Elizabeth, not of our faith, followed in her footsteps in intolerance and death-dealing, persecuting not only those of our Catholic faith, but ultra-reformers who went too far on the other side, of whom also she did not approve. In fact, she opposed any or all who might interfere with her ambitions."

"Sire," said Anglic, "these facts are admitted, but they do not alter the results of what was done in the reign of Mary as I have stated them."

Before further reply could be made, Objector, again irrepressible, was on his feet, asking to be heard:

"If, Sire, your witness, my friend Protest, had not been silenced for discourtesy, Anglic would meet with opposition from an entirely different side. I speak for Protest only because he has been silenced. Anglic claims that his Church is satisfactory to all, a *via media*. But the other ancient historic churches reject him, and also those represented by Protest will have none of him. They have an enmity against the Church of Anglic. It is considered to have pretensions to be counted everything and yet be nothing. We consider it the offspring of a foreigner as much as Rome is. It is the embodiment of a system that tries to perpetuate the mysticism of the Middle Ages in the twentieth century, as if it was necessary for the body of the Church of to-day to wear the garments in use five hundred years ago. It claims that formalism is reverence. It says that its clergy are Divinely appointed, have Divine right through their unbroken line, and hence that those whom Protest calls clergy are no clergy at all. It gives them no respect and shows them no fellowship. It takes this stand in the effort for unity with great historic bodies, but they all reject its claims. The validity of its clerical

orders is questioned by Greek and Latin, because it cannot truthfully claim that the rite of conferring them is a sacrament with the conveyance of sacramental grace, it having but two sacraments of which this is not one. On the other hand, the Church of Anglic does not consider valid certain episcopal orders possessed by the Swedish Church, the Methodist, or the Moravian, and the Presbyterate of a great series of churches it does not recognise as authentic.

"A union of the Church of Anglic with either the Greek or Roman is impossible, and with the churches friendly to Protest such unity would be more than impossible. It were folly to expect it. In order to secure it Protest would have to receive from Anglic orders whose validity is in question by both East and West. Anglic is counted exclusive. He thinks himself better than others who are not of him. He worships wealth. He is un-American because, as the offspring of monarchy, he is opposed to democratic institutions. He is unprogressive,—in fact dead."[1]

[1] The Episcopal Church alone of all churches stands wholly aloof from all others, and wrapping about itself the flimsy and tattered mantle of apostolic succession, an exclusive genuine divine authority and ordination, which its own best scholars repudiate, says: "You are, all of you, all wrong." It is on this basis that it refuses to recognise other clergymen as such; that it organises a St. Andrew's Society instead of working with the Y. M. C. A.; that its young people take no part in the Society for Christian Endeavour; and that, copying from the King's Daughters, it starts an exclusive Episcopal society; showing everywhere a purpose to flock by itself, and not join, as other sects are doing, in work for humanity on broad Christian lines.—*Letter in New York Tribune.*

Father Dyer of the Protestant Episcopal Church has been instructing a large congregation in the "Difference between Catholic and Protestant." Of course he is a member of the "old Catholic, apostolic and historical Church of God." He very generously admits that the Roman Catholic and the Greek Churches are parts of this same Church, and doubtless would be pleased if those Churches would say a similar thing of his Church, but, unfortunately, they will not. With the usual effrontery that characterises such gentlemen, he boldly declares, without advancing a scintilla of proof, that "these three were once the one Church of the living God, founded by Christ and continued by His

"What have you to say in reply, Anglic?" asked the Moderator.

"As to Objector's statements, I am sorry if any have so far misunderstood us. Such opinions can come only from those who know us not. As for other clergy than ours, we do not contend that they are not properly commissioned, but that they are not the officers of our particular portion of the Church army. While fellow-soldiers, they are not our immediate superiors whose commands we must obey. As for the validity of our clerical orders and our continuous line with the past, these subjects have been argued for centuries, but our claims are not admitted by those whose interests would not be served by such an admission. The Anglican Churches have never to this day undertaken to declare either that non-episcopal Churches are no churches, or that ministers not episcopally ordained are not ministers. Not one word on that subject has ever been uttered by any Anglican Church. The Church of England and her daugh-

---

twelve apostles and by their consecrated and ordained successors since Christ died until to-day." It does not seem to occur to the preacher that this bold statement demands any proof. All other Churches are "man-made, man-governed, and their forms and orders were the invention of man alone." No other Churches save his own and those whom he condescends to recognise, have, according to the preacher, any "god-given or apostolic authority for their existence."—*The (Reformed) Episcopal Recorder.*

The friends of the cause are grieved, and some of us are frankly indignant that another effort at Church union should be rendered futile, if not ridiculous, by the time-worn proposition of the Episcopalians. Of course, my dearly beloved brethren, if we all become Episcopalians, Protestantism is united. We all understood that perfectly in the old days of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. That this same proposition should be made again, in more elaborate form, is a disappointment bordering on exasperation. Ought it not to be understood from this time forth, that any denomination which proposes to give up nothing and puts forth its own pet creed as a basis, is thereby disqualified to sit in any body called to consider the subject of Church union?—James H. Ecob in *Homiletic Review*, July, 1910. New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company.

ter churches judge for themselves, act for themselves, and act for reasons which they hold to be sound and good, but they pronounce no judgment upon others who have judged and acted otherwise.

"The whole subject, that of this apostolic succession, is too large to be argued in this connection. Later, should it be your command, at the request of any here who may not agree with us, we shall be ready for the argument. One thing is certain, we may not have originated this movement for unity but we are at least the only Church which until now has made definite offers to that end. But I am sure that you, Sire, knowing the Divine ability so intimately, would be the last to rebuke me for believing, notwithstanding the seeming impossibility of a greater union of ourselves with the older bodies of Christendom on the one side, or with the newer bodies, unless we renounce our ancient Catholic heritage, on the other, that such things are entirely possible in the Divine economy, when you, Sire, or your Divine Master and ours, may show us the way."

"Sire," interrupted Greatheart, "there are many here who side with Protest, for whom Objector has spoken, yet who, while not co-workers with Anglic, are his firm friends, and would speak for him in glowing terms as you may give the opportunity. These tell me that our friend Protest is not representative of his class. It is for you to judge."

"I am one of that class," said a new witness. "I am of the sect of Protest if you will that it should be so-called, but agree not with him."

"The witness is wrong," said Greatheart; "he is of the Church of Protest. The particular sect to which he may belong is of no importance. As he has said, this brother is one of those to whom I referred. His name is Conservative."

"Then, if it is Greatheart's request, I would beg that you hear him, Sire," said Charity, who, next to the Moderator, was the most active member of the Commission.

"I can indeed testify," proceeded Conservative, "without unfaithfulness to my own Church, or desire to leave it, as to the great value of the historic Church of Anglic, though with some of the details of its teachings I do not entirely agree; nor can I agree with those of my brethren whose imperfect sight, guided by their imperfect knowledge, can discern in that Church nothing but a diminutive copy of Rome. Because Anglic holds to old heritages which Rome claims are copied from her, though they are also Anglic's by birthright, which unhappily I have rejected, he is not aping Rome. I would remind my own brethren that, as he has said, he has not yielded to Rome's claims for jurisdiction over all Christendom. Nor does he teach the Roman doctrine of indulgences, whereby good works of the faithful may be applied to shorten the term of souls in purgatory. Nor does he countenance the worship, not merely the simple invocation 'Ora pro nobis,' of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, under which elaborate system prayers for direct blessings at their hands are asked, irrespective of the Almighty, or our blessed Lord. Perhaps this statement is unjust to Romanus. I am reminded that he claims, and perhaps truthfully, for my knowledge of his doctrine is not what it should be, that he asks of the Virgin and saints only intercession on his behalf. But at least Anglic does not encourage the addressing of such extravagant epithets as 'Queen of Heaven,' 'Mother of Sorrows,' 'Mother of Consolation' to the blessed Virgin Mary. Nor does he approve of the sale of masses, the withholding of the cup from the laity, the Romish definition of the Real Presence, as I understand it, the enforced celibacy of the clergy, or the conduct of services in a tongue not understood by the people.

"But in one thing the public worship of the Church of my friend Anglic often excels that of my own, that is in reverence. I believe with him that the presence of a living God in a building more or less dedicated to Him by the offering of services, or at least by the religious gatherings

of his followers, makes it holy, and not a suitable place for secular amusements. Even if I may not hold his views of what he calls the Sacrament of the Holy Sacrifice, in which we see but a memorial, I feel that the participant should maintain a reverent attitude. I would kneel where my fellows would stand. Some even refuse to leave their seats to approach a table, which if not God's altar is at least set in remembrance of Him, preferring, at their ease, to be served by Christ Himself through His representatives."

"Is it the wish of Anglic to have further speech?" asked the Moderator.

"Sire," replied Anglic, "I am grateful for your consideration. I wish to say, and most emphatically, that I do not consider this brother Conservative, though not of my belief, without the historic Church. He is a Christian, and if he does not consider himself a part of the historic Church, he at least came from it and is now separated not by his own act but by an inherited misfortune which is mine as well as his. In all essentials except Church government he is with us. Inwardly and spiritually his brethren constitute a Church of Christ. Outwardly they have history to back them. Above all things they stand for order in the ministry. We have historic episcopacy. They have what we call the historic presbyterate. Their clergy undoubtedly receive the grace for which they pray. We claim them as a part of a Catholic Church which must, if Catholic, be inclusive and not exclusive. Christ did not forbid in any wise even the work of those who went not with His disciples. But these brethren claim to be disciples of Christ. They act as if they were. They obey His commandments, love one another, pray without ceasing, forsake not the assembling of themselves together, show forth the fruits of the spirit, in fact do all that we do, and often do it better.[1] They

[1] It is a palpable fact, perfectly evident to all who are not so blinded with the bandage of sectarian prejudice that they cannot see such facts, that both the Sacerdotal Catholics and Republican Protestants are, everywhere, throughout Christendom, with equal success, living the

have been 'baptised into Christ,' and have 'put on Christ.' More still, they do things ecclesiastical in decency and in order. It cannot be denied that they have done a work for God and man which our branch of the Church with its advantages cannot well contemplate with any degree of self-complacency. They have established in all lands their mission stations, till the whole earth is encircled. They have scattered the Word of God among all nations, and poured out treasures untold in support of Christian institutions whose influence in promoting the coming of the Kingdom of God is beyond compute. Upon them the blessing of the Lord seems to rest. Who, with more confidence, can point to results in vindication of their claims? When we survey those goodly companies and their gracious works how can we think that they are in any wise aliens from the Church of God?

"Nevertheless, I stand for my Church because it is not only historic but because it is my firm belief that its government is centralised, particularly in its native home. And here it is not undemocratic, as charged, but stands for all that is best in forms of Church government called Presbyterian, Congregational, or Methodist. But we have not differentiated, made separate by a difference, as they have; or integrated, or obligatorily made whole, as has Romanism. Here we have not so great centralisation in ecclesiastical headship as our Church has in its native land, but we have a democratic government as effective. We resemble our mother as a child, with differences, due somewhat to education and environment; as an American elm resembles

---

Christ life and growing into the full stature of exemplary Christian manhood and womanhood. Since, then, both have the substance and bear the fruits of sacramental grace, why should they continue their hurtful disputings, as to whether or not the Christ life and growth which they respectively exhibit is to be explained as the result of an infusion of grace or the strengthening of grace?—From *The Level Plan for Church Union*, by William Montgomery Brown, Bishop of Arkansas. New York. Thomas Whittaker.

the English variety with variations in foliation and other characteristics.

"Now as to my first claim that our Church is particularly well situated, on middle ground, to reach all sides in an effort for unity. We recognise the good in all, what we owe to Greek for the preservation of our faith, to Rome and the Roman Empire for our vitality, and to the Germanic people for the personal freedom of modern civilisation. We inculcate respect for women, particularly in an honourable marriage state, we urge the preservation of the home, and our Saxon heritage, parliamentary representation, is embodied in our constitution.

"The Church of England in her relation to the state has kept before the minds of men the fact that the magistrate on the bench is, in his own sphere, just as divine as the priest at the altar; and that society is at its best estate when Church and state, whether dependent or not, recognise each other as necessary to a properly constituted social state. The family, the Church, and the state—these are the three fundamental institutions on which the well-being of human society depends; and it is the glory of the Church of England that she teaches her children to give to each the honour which rightly belongs to it as ordained by God. Bound to the past by an unbroken link of succession from the Apostles, in sympathy with the present by her relation to the races to which the future destiny of the world is for the time being committed, indebted to the Greek Church for the formulating of the faith, and to the Latin for her gift of order and administration, the Church of England[1] may surely recognise in this ordering of Divine

[1] Thomas Richey in *Presentation of the Anglican Church.*

If the Church of England has never by any act of her own recognised the name of Protestant it is because the maxim *cujus regio est, illius religio est*, has ever been a cherished principle of her national life. Nearly six centuries ago the Church of England in her acts of Provisors and Præmunire (A.D. 1350–1393) resisted the claims of any foreign temporal or spiritual power to interfere with the affairs of her national life. Her

Providence a providential call to be the healer of the breach, in the midst of a divided and distracted Christendom."

English Bible and her Book of Common Prayer bear witness that her children are not mere spectators at a religious drama. Nowhere in all the world is the priesthood such a moral power as it is in England to-day, due to the sanctity of the domestic life of the clergy.—*Ibid.*

THETA

Of Such Stuff Were Martyrs Made

A REMARKABLE peculiarity in the proceedings of this august assembly, but not noticeable to those engaged in it, was the unhuman methods. There were no formal sessions terminating at fixed intervals, no necessary periods for refreshment or rest. The proceedings were uninterrupted. Differences of night and day were of no account. Fatigue was not considered. The immense throng sat immovable, and as opportunities to hear new witnesses occurred, many were anxious to take advantage of them. The members of the Commission appeared to be totally indifferent as to time, as if their familiarity were more with a system in which a thousand years were as one day and one day as a thousand years.

As Anglic terminated his testimony, a new witness at once asked to be heard.

"I am brother to him called Conservative, who has testified, yet agree not with him in all things. My name is Presbus."

The speaker was an elderly man of evident strength of character, of appearance which might be called rugged, whose evident intelligence, learning, and singleness of purpose gained for him instant respect.

The Moderator asked if he had been one of the original petitioners whose prayers had been the primary cause of the hearing.

"At your request, Mr. Moderator——"

The witness was interrupted by several, including Anglic, Romanus, and Conservative, who asked that the witness should show more respect to the presiding officer, the special representative of Deity, and address him by some title not so expressive of equality with the speaker.

Before the Moderator could speak, Charity pleaded for the witness, excusing him on the ground that perhaps in his opinion such marks of respect should be reserved for Godhead Itself. His apparent discourtesy might not be intentional.

"Let the witness proceed," ruled the Moderator. "It is the intention, not the words, that our Master judges. While the Divine Majesty is here represented in our person, we claim not divinity ourselves. We are justified by the teachings of Him who humbled Himself to become man for men."

"Then, Moderator, with thanks for overlooking what might seem boorishness on my part, which I assure you was not so intended, I would say that we, myself and those with me, were not actively identified with the immediate appeal which brought you and yours among us. One of us, however, claims to have been the originator of a demand for unity which has now taken more complete form. A half century ago a member of one of our related bodies[1] brought himself into disrepute by urging the unpopular idea of abolition of all sectarian lines between Protestants in America. But this was not the first effort of the kind in Christendom. Immediately following the divisions of the great Reformation and the split from Rome on the part of Protestants, it was seen that the zeal of later reformers in many things went too far. The right of individual judgment uncurbed by authority even then produced such variety of belief, with divisions and subdivisions, that virtually orthodoxy was only each one's own opinion, while heterodoxy or heresy stood for the belief of every one else.

[1] Rev. Wm. McCune of the United Presbyterian Church, in 1867.

The one man who held for moderation in the midst of turmoil[1] was not strong enough to still it. One of his followers[2] laid down the first basis for Christian unity, but his teachings were unpopular. Then a member of a moderate theological school in Germany[3] first voiced the sentiment of a predecessor[4] which was later put into English[5] and its form was: in necessary things, unity; in things indifferent, liberty; in all, charity.[6] These men have had many followers to the present time."

"And are you now interested in this unity?" asked the Moderator.

"I might reply in the negative in so far as the union of all Christendom is concerned. In fact I might be said to oppose it, though we can see the numerous disadvantages of disunion. But some of my faith, Conservative may be one of them, think differently. Our Church organisation with others has been made the recipient of a query[7] from the

[1] Melancthon. [2] George Calixtus, 1614–1656.
[3] Conradus Bergius, Frankfort-on-Oder.
[4] Rupertus Meldinus, 1627. [5] By Richard Baxter.
[6] Irenic Movements since the Reformation, John F. Hurst.

[7] In pursuance of the action taken in 1853 for the healing of the divisions of Christians in our own land, and in 1880 for the protection and encouragement of those who had withdrawn from the Roman obedience, we here assembled in Council, assembled as Bishops of the Church of God, do hereby solemnly declare to all whom it may concern, and especially to our fellow Christians of the different communions in this land, who, in their several spheres, have contended for the religion of Christ:

(1) Our earnest desire that the Saviour's Prayer "that we all may be one" may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled.

(2) That we believe that all who have been duly baptised with Water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, are members of the Holy Catholic Church.

(3) That in things of human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline, or to traditional customs, this Church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of their own.

(4) That this Church does not seek to absorb other Communions, but rather, co-operating with them on the basis of a common Faith and Order to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the Body of

friends of Anglic asking if we could agree to a certain basis for unity, offered without any plan by which it might be carried out, to which we have been compelled to reply negatively because we were unable to agree as to the status of our clergy."

"Then you rejected this proposal through pride on a question of precedence," remarked the Moderator.

"Not so. It was a question of principle. The inquiry was received with great satisfaction as the first utterance of the Church from which it came which officially recognised that the great body which I represent exists here as a dis-

---

Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world.

But, furthermore, we do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired by the Memorialists [*i.e.*, those who had memorialised the General Convention on the subject of Christian unity] can be restored only by the return of all Christian Communions to the principles of Unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.

As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among divided branches of Christendom, we count the following, to wit:—

(I.) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God.

(II.) The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

(III.) The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

(IV.) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.—*Adopted by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the United States, Oct. 20, 1886, and reaffirmed with slight modifications in 1888 by the Lambeth Conference representing the Church of England and her daughters throughout the world.*

tinctive branch of the Christian Church. But we have been putting theories of unity into practice so far as we ourselves are concerned, by healing notable breaches in our own midst which were great hindrances in Christian work."

"If, as you say, you are not particularly interested in this question, or indeed hardly approve of it, how is it that you wish to be heard at all in this inquiry?"

"Solely because one of us, Conservative, has been heard, and I did not wish his testimony to go unchallenged as the opinion of all of his fellows, of whom he is not entirely representative."

"And is this Church, to which both you and Conservative belong, also what you term an ancient church, that is to say, has it existed continuously since the Master came upon earth?"

"We trace our descent as Christians through the older Church of Rome from which we separated through protest against corruption. As a separate body we may be called modern, dating from this reforming era."

"What is your opinion regarding this Church of Rome as it is to-day?"

"In my personal opinion it is now hardly a Christian Church, being too much sunk in superstition and error, though in its early ages it was. My brother, Conservative, thinks differently."

"Then you think not alike even in your own membership? If you allow this latitude among yourselves cannot you extend it so far as to respect differences with those outside?"

"It is not my wish that we should have this freedom. Had I my way we should all believe alike and think alike and speak alike, or those who differ should go out from us."

"Then you follow Rome in that. By some this has been called intolerance."

Greatheart here spoke, to the manifest relief of both Peace and Charity:

"O Sire, believe him not. His honesty makes him desirous to claim no more than that to which he is entitled. He appears more intolerant than he really is. He is the best of men, and the most learned. My friend Anglic will testify that next to his own people with no one would he feel more at home than with this very Presbus. Both come from common racial stock and are as brothers. With both law is respected and both prefer decency and order. The very peculiarities of Presbus, due to sensitiveness of conscience, command respect. From him Anglic has largely borrowed his forms of Church government in America and in return Presbus is now largely borrowing from Anglic forms of worship which are found more beautiful and satisfying than those which for a time were typical of Presbus. Those were pure and simple formalism but form only without adornment."

"But, Moderator," said Presbus, "let it be remembered that the adoption of such more elaborate forms by my brethren is not with my consent but against what I think is right. To adopt them is in effect to say that we know better than our fathers who rejected them."

"Do not believe a word of it, Sire," said Greatheart, "the brother honestly deludes himself into the belief that he does not love his own Church sufficiently to accept it in whatever form its duly constituted authorities may see proper to mould it."

Again Objector arose:

"I hope, Sire, you will not be again deceived by the plausible kindliness of this professional sayer of pleasant things, Greatheart. He means well but he is weak in argument."

To this the Moderator replied:

"We may be deceived, Objector, but it may not matter. You may recall that He whom we serve tries the hearts of men and knows all things."

"At all events," continued Objector, "as to this man Presbus, he is the most narrow-minded religious man on

the face of the earth. One of his narrow inherited beliefs is, that the merciful God has foreordained from all eternity that certain men are born to be saved and others to be eternally lost, no matter what they in their lifetime may do to avert such a catastrophe. This is unhuman. It is not Godlike. Allow me to cite a concrete example of its results. This belief had so permeated the mind of an ignorant servant girl of my acquaintance, with the conviction that she was doomed to be eternally damned, that she daily practised the inhaling of fumes from burning sulphur in order to accustom herself to her expected hereafter. What kind of a belief is that for reasoning beings?"

"I pray you, Sire, that you will ask Conservative, the brother of Presbus, if he has such belief," said Greatheart.

Conservative, however, could not be found at the moment.

"Then, I would beg you, Sire, to ask Presbus to tell you the history of his Church. It has had an honourable past."

"That would be impossible in these limits, Moderator," said Presbus, "nor would it be desirable, nor yet of value. What we are, as you have ruled, is important. That I can tell you, touching as lightly as possible on the past."

"Do so."

"Our family in America, called Presbyterians, holds a place of great importance in the religious life of the nation. It has weight beyond its numerical strength through the services it has rendered to theological science, the interest it has maintained in Christian doctrine, the high standard of intelligence it has set up both for its ministry and its people, its capacity to develop strength of character, its superior family discipline, and its conservative influence upon the national life. In Church organisation it is the pioneer in the creation of that synodical type of government which now constitutes the actual policy of nearly all American churches, even those which hold to the theory of congregational independency on the one side, or of diocesan episcopacy on the other.

"Presbyterianism knows of no higher work and it recog-

nises no higher calling than that of the pastor of the Christian congregation, in whom it sees the bishop of the first churches. Yet it also recognises a Church whose extent transcends the Christian congregation, and takes shape in provincial, national, and ecumenical synods, councils, or assemblies, vested with authority to speak for the larger unities they represent.

"Our reformers were obliged, in effecting the emancipation of the Protestant nations from the usurped authority of the Bishop of Rome, to make radical changes in the system they found in existence. They, however, started from elements of doctrine, worship, and organisation they found already at hand, and which they found in harmony with their reading of the New Testament. To these they gave a new weight, setting them in a new perspective, but claiming to be reformers, and not revolutionists. The Presbyterian reformers in the British Islands did their work more thoroughly and with less regard to historic tradition than some of the others. They took as the official unit the pastorate exercised by the parish priest of the Latin Church, whom they accepted as bishop in the apostolic sense, and as amply empowered to transmit his own office by ordination.

"But polity was by no means the most noteworthy characteristic of our Church. It has always put theological doctrine in its foreground. It has laid a stress upon doctrinal soundness as an element of wholesome Church life. Its weaker side has perhaps been an over-confidence in the adequacy of human logic to bring the truth of the Scriptures into a systematic form, and to present it in a coherent sequence which the Bible does not seek to furnish.

"In its forms of worship this reformed Church was formerly liturgic, yet with a striving after simplicity and an indifference to the older liturgic traditions. But the most characteristic element in the life of the Church, and that by which it influenced history the most profoundly, was neither its polity, nor its type of doctrine, nor its forms of

worship, but its ethical and social discipline. In certain countries, notably Scotland, the continuous pressure of session and presbytery, synod and assembly, was exerted for the extirpation of vice, and the elevation of social life."[1]

"If you will permit me," the speaker was Romanus, "I can add my testimony to that of my friend Greatheart, in opposition to the remarks of Objector, and in favour of this Presbus, to whom I am more friendly than he is towards me. I can testify as to the intellectual and moral worth of these Presbyterians, their philanthropy and zeal for God, and the value of many most excellent works which they have written in defence of the Divine revelation. Great numbers of them have surely been and are in the spiritual communion of the Catholic Church. We desire that the schism which has separated them from our visible communion may be healed, not only for their spiritual good, but also that our Church may be strengthened by the accession of that intellectual and religious vigour which such a mass of baptised Christians contains in itself."[2]

"As you bear such an amiable character," said the Moderator, addressing the waiting witness, Presbus, "you may tell us and our fellow-inquisitors what of your belief and practice you would be willing to give up for the sake of this desired unity."

"Nothing, so help me Almighty God," was the reply.

"Believe him not," said Greatheart. "He would give up everything if he thought it his duty."

Charity showed his evident pleasure at the quickly spoken words of Greatheart, which at once turned the startling reply of Presbus into one of harmless pleasantry. Addressing the Moderator, Charity said:

"This man Greatheart and we are surely friends. There is much in common."

"And if like unto you, our dear Charity," returned the

[1] From a *History of The Presbyterian Churches in the United States*, by Robert Ellis Thompson. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons.

[2] *The Catholic World* (Roman), New York.

Moderator, "he is to that extent not at variance with the Master whom we serve and whose will is ours. But, friend Presbus, tell us more particularly why it was that you rejected that well-meant offer for unity of which you spoke."

"We rejected it, as we did one sent previously by the head of the Church of Rome, whose kindly sentiments we appreciated, but whose propositions we also respectfully declined, because we could not accept it without repudiating all which has made us a church and a church of which no one may be ashamed. This offer of Anglic involved what he considers four essentials to Christian unity: the Holy Scriptures, Catholic creeds, two sacraments, and an Historic Episcopate. The first three present no difficulties to us. The fourth involves an assumption in favour of diocesan episcopacy, to which we cannot assent without shutting our eyes to the facts of Church history."

"Sire," asked Anglic, "might it please you to now consider, especially and separately, the subject which this reply brings up, this Historic Episcopate, calling all who may wish to testify for it or against it? It is a subject of great importance, and one which has been greatly discussed. At the present time it is the one great stumbling-block in the way of a greater Christian fellowship between ourselves and many other worthy Christians."

"Be it so then," replied the Moderator. "Let it be done at once."

IOTA

In Line with Christ's Messengers

"AS it is in accordance with your request, Anglic, that we consider this matter," said the Moderator, "it is our wish that you now more particularly describe this stumbling-block which you call by the name 'Historic Episcopate,' and tell us what is its importance. If it is a stumbling-block why insist upon it?"

Said Anglic:

"In this connection, for the purpose of expediting unity, we designate by the name 'Historic Episcopate' what we and the other historic churches know as the Apostolic Succession, for the reason that in putting forth its claims as a ground for unity we dwell, not on the priceless heritage itself, which links us by an unbroken line with the one holy and apostolic Church of the past and marks us and others who retain it as a portion of the Catholic Church, but on the fact that it now exists, an established historic reality, and that it is a most suitable basis for unity. It must retain our allegiance, for one reason, because it is required by the great majority of all Christians. By discarding it we would be in danger of losing all hope of a closer union with a larger number, in the possible vain hope of greater fellowship with a smaller. It is a condition of the Church which in some form has always existed since the Church began. Those who have discarded it have done unnecessary violence to the integrity of the Church.

"The term Apostolic Succession in the Roman Church

means an unbroken line of bishops from the chief Apostle Peter. The Anglican Church claims a line of regular Episcopal ordination, from and past the pre-Reformation Church, back to the Apostles. With the authenticity of this line of bishops is connected the authenticity of the ministry ordained by them. It involves the question whether those not so ordained constitute an authorised ministry."

"That 's my idea," interrupted Militant. "Lawful commissions. Centralised authority. Permanency. Then we can fight."

"The pity is that we have to fight," remarked Representative, the witness who first stated the case and drew attention to the hindrances involved in the present conditions. "Undoubtedly our military friend means fighting against the world, the flesh, and the devil. The trouble is that these divisions make us do most of the fighting among ourselves. The noisy assertion of the rival claims of these differing sections of the Christian Church, these one hundred and forty competitive voices, remind me of the shouting of so many cabmen in the highway, each willing and anxious to carry us to Heaven."[1]

"And Friend," observed Presbus, "you must remember that any one of the cabs can take you there, whichever one seems to you most suitable, or the one which happens to have a driver who gets hold of you first, though I must say there is one build I prefer."

A slight pause followed this diversion, then Anglic resumed:

"Limiting ourselves to the historical phase of the question, our contentions are disputed only so far as the first century of the Christian Church is concerned. From that time until some three hundred years ago, or for a space of some fourteen centuries, Episcopacy was the only form of Church government, and it existed in undisputed continuous lines up to the Reformation period. From that time we have our own proofs of continuity.

[1] W. R. Huntington.

"As to why we consider the Historic Episcopate essential to Church unity, I would say:

"First because it is evident that if all Christians are to be joined together in one body there can be but one form of Church government. It can hardly be imagined that a new form should be invented. If one of the present forms be chosen should it not be one which obtained universally for at least fourteen centuries and which is now received by nine-tenths of those professing Christianity rather than one which has been in vogue only for a hundred years or at most three hundred years among a small section of the remaining tenth of Christians?

"Secondly. Because with the vast majority of those holding to the Episcopate it is a matter of conscience. With them it makes all the difference between a Divine and a human institution. They cannot believe that it should have been so universally received, and lasted so long, if it had not been due to Divine Providence.

"Thirdly. The Protestant denominations generally do not consider the matter of Church government as of Divine ordainment. If it is therefore a matter of conscience with some and not with others, should not those to whom it is not such, yield to those to whom it is?

"Fourthly. The Episcopate was not the original cause of separation. Many of the original reformers regretted its loss, and looked upon other forms merely as temporary expedients to be adopted until it could be recovered. Or where there was a protest against Episcopacy it was against an autocratic, tyrannical, worldly prelacy.

"Fifthly. Episcopacy is in its nature inclusive and complementary of other forms. Presbyterianism includes Congregationalism but excludes Episcopacy; Congregationalism excludes both Presbyterianism and Episcopacy; but Episcopacy includes all three.

"Sixthly. It has proved itself effective and gives that executive which the others lack, while it includes all their advantages, since it is perfectly possible to combine with it

large independence in the congregations and co-ordinate authority in the Presbyterate.

"Seventhly. Its acceptance is essential to any hope of eventual union with the Roman and Greek churches, to the preservation of continuity with the past, and to the maintenance of unity in the future. For as all the divisions of Christians have been due to the belief that the matter of Church government was indifferent, and that any man, or number of men, could form a new Church, so unity, if once accomplished, could only be maintained by agreement to accept this principle, that none should take upon himself to exercise office in the Church unless he had received authority to do so from those upon whom that authority had been previously conferred."[1]

Said Objector:

"It were better to have the living Spirit of Christ in their hearts and the burning eloquence of the Holy Spirit on their lips, than for the clergy to rely on historic succession and ancient creeds as marks of a living witness of the truth. My brother Anglic relies on the succession only and, as he has stated, he holds to Episcopacy in the hope of a union with the two larger bodies of ancient Christians, who both reject his claims. By so doing he separates himself from all."

"What is the opinion of your Church," asked the Moderator of Romanus, "as to the claims of your friend Anglic?"

"His bishops and clergy are not in the true line. They have been officially condemned by our head."

"Which is Christ?" asked the Moderator.

"Our head is the Vicar of Christ."

"Sire," said Objector, "I believe in fair play. I object when necessary, without regard to whom I criticise. I dislike the claims of Anglic for his succession. No less do I dislike this statement of Romanus. His reiterated assertion that he represents the only true Church, and the Church which has the only one true representative of

[1] From *Papers of the Church Unity Society*, 1896.

Christ on earth, is tiresome. The Church of Romanus is a schismatic church and the mother of schisms. It is responsible for the formation and present continuance of the great Protestant schism. And neither that Church nor the Eastern Church should cast a stone on the present divisions of Protestantism, for it was several centuries before the great protest that the undivided Catholic Church split at the Great Schism into the Eastern and Western churches, nominally on the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit, but really on the question of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome. This division lasts to the present day and is as far from being healed as ever.[1] Both Greek

[1] The full text of the reply made by Anthimus VII. of Constantinople and his suffragans to the encyclical on unity of Leo XIII. of Rome contains nothing particularly new, but it is nevertheless interesting and instructive reading. Constantinople seems as anxious as Rome for unity among the Christian churches. But the Greek bishops stoutly oppose the terms upon which Rome, whose bishops, they say, "the evil one has inflated with thoughts of accessive arrogance," proposes to the Christian world. Anthimus VII. and his suffragans charge Leo XIII. and his communion with heresy, systematic persecution in the past, and treacherous intrusion in the present. The papacy is a system of "anti-evangelical and utterly lawless innovations." Its position is an unhistorical one. Union of the Eastern Greek and Western Latin churches is under such circumstances out of the question. In their opposition to Rome, Canterbury and Constantinople are as one. May we look forward to the time when the union of the Greek and Anglo-Saxon churches shall be reckoned, as Abbé Portal, no mean Roman authority, is already inclined to reckon it, among the things that are not only practicable, but sure eventually to come about.—*The Churchman.*

Since 1053 there has been no communion between the Roman and the so-called Greek churches. Here, then, is a large body, holding strenuously to Catholic doctrine and discipline, but rejecting entirely the claims of the Pope, and declaring itself, and not the Roman body, orthodox. And this body, too, cannot yield its theory of independence without reflecting upon every point in its career since the separation. The position of the Anglican Church is not unlike that of the Greek. They were enabled to defy the authority of Rome without falling under the authority of Geneva. In this way the English Church and its later offshoots have preserved Catholic doctrine and discipline, though separated from Rome and from Constantinople both, in spite of many

and Latin share in the sin and guilt of schism, and both should also share in a common repentance."[1]

"I beg, Sire," said Anglic, "to call your attention to the fact that this not only reopens the question of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome but that my brother Objector speaks as if he too thought that the churches of Rome and the East were the only two churches in existence in the ninth century when they separated. He forgets, as I have shown, that there was another, the Church of my ancestors, inherently an independent Early Church, whose birthrights were for a time illegally taken away by corrupt rulers against the protests of those to whom they rightfully belonged and which were afterwards regained by repudiating the usurpers.[2]

"In reply to Romanus I would instance history, as it was solely on historical grounds that, for many years, his Church has criticised the validity of our succession and clerical orders, though now, that our proofs are more generally acknowledged, other reasons are given. Rome sees the necessity for discrediting our line, for if ours is authentic why retain as she does a hierarchy of her own in England? Our line came not only through our own sources but also through those whom she has always recognised. In a critical time, in the perils of the unsettled times of the English Reformation, our line was providentially continued through but one channel,[3] through which all later English orders were secured. The validity of the four bishops who

---

almost successful attempts to Protestantise, or at least de-Catholicise every one of them. The Anglican assertion, is, therefore, that it is more truly catholic and apostolic than is Rome herself, and that the orders of its clergy have been regularly derived from the same apostolic source as Rome's own orders. This, too, is a position which is perfectly logical, granting the point of view, and which it would be impossible for English and American churchmen to abandon without depriving their Church of any standing ground whatever.—*Providence Journal.*

[1] Philip Schaff.

[2] See Appendix V. "The Organic Continuity of the Church of England."

[3] Archbishop Parker.

joined in the consecration of the bishop who was the connecting link is questioned. Three were challenged on the ground that they were but bishops of the English rite. So far as they are concerned the older historical criticism is abandoned and the claim is made that the English rite is defective. In regard to the fourth bishop[1] Rome says that he had never been consecrated, though history says that she fully recognised him as a bishop.[2]

"The importance of the qualifications of this Roman bishop is apparent. If only one consecrating bishop is legal, the succession is legal. Therefore the historic regularity of this one bishop is strongly questioned. In the effort to disqualify him our opponents have even invented a ridiculous fable which denied that this bishop had any consecration whatever, except in mockery.[3]

"As for the contention which affects the other three bishops, that the English rite of consecration was defective, it was claimed that it was so on the ground that there was insufficiency of the matter of the sacrament.[4] Again it was assailed on the plea that the form of words in consecration by English rite was insufficient. Now, under a later affirmation of the Roman head all of these pleas are abandoned as incapable of proof. The historical fable, the defective matter, and the insufficient form of words, are alike set aside, and a new defect is given as the only ground for the refusal to recognise the validity of our line,

[1] Barlow, consecrated under Henry VIII. by Latin bishops and by the Latin rite.

[2] He had been bishop of three different sees, had publicly sat as such in convocation and the House of Lords, and had assisted in at least two consecrations under Henry VIII. His Episcopal character as a Bishop of the Roman rite was undisputed even in the reign of Queen Mary.

[3] See Appendix VI. "Nag's Head Fable."

[4] The use of both the laying on of hands, and the delivery of the paten with bread and the chalice with wine as required by the Roman rite.

in that there was defective intention on the part of those who administered the rite."[1]

"We see," said the Moderator, "that this discussion is endless. Enough for the present, Anglic. What is your opinion, Presbus, as to this historic succession of Anglic?"

"That it does not exist, Moderator, in the sense by which he claims superiority for his clergy over ours. We have as clear and unbroken a line of succession as he has, in fact more authentic and less questioned; and we are if anything more careful of its authentic continuity, but we call our hierarchy by a different name."[2]

"What is your opinion, Luthrem?"

[1] The English Ordination services have long been the object of hostile criticism, but it is unnecessary to enlarge upon this, for it is no longer seriously disputed that the forms contained in them are adequate in themselves. It is still, however, maintained that the Ordination of Priests shows a defective intention, inasmuch as it does not expressly confer the "sacerdotium" or power of offering sacrifice. To this it may be replied, first, that the old Roman rite and other ancient rites do not mention sacrifice at all; secondly, that Ordination is to an office and not to any particular function of that office, and that it is not necessary to specify every function; thirdly, that in giving power to minister the sacraments, the Church necessarily gives power to offer sacrifice; and fourthly, that even if the English Church took a wrong view of the functions of the ministry, this would not invalidate her orders if conferred by qualified persons with an adequate rite.—From *A History of the Book of Common Prayer*, by J. H. Maude. New York. Edwin S. Gorham.

[2] Leonard Woolsey Bacon, a Congregational clergyman, in *A History of American Christianity*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, thus reports the substance of a sermon delivered by Bishop Hobart, of New York, at the Consecration of Bishop Onderdonk in 1827:

The Church (meaning his own fragment of the Church) was the one channel of saving grace; the vehicles of that grace, the sacraments, valid only when ministered by a priesthood with the right pedigree of ordination; submission to the constituted authority of the Church absolutely unlimited, except by clear Divine requirements; abstinence from prayer-meetings; firm opposition to revivals of religion; refusal of all co-operation with Christians outside of his own sect in endeavours for the general advancement of religion—such were some of the principles and duties inculcated by this bishop as of binding force.

"We have no objection to his line or one like it; in fact in some countries we ourselves still retain one which we think will some day be universally recognised as such, but surely by Anglic. Luther, the master reformer of the Church of Rome and the founder of our branch of the Church, wished to retain such a line. He deeply lamented his inability to retain it, and the evils which he foresaw might result from the precedent which he established in founding a church without a bishop of the succession. However the Episcopate may have originated, all the reformers of the European continent, Melancthon, Zwingli, or Calvin were anxious to preserve it. They congratulated the reformed Church of England on having secured the Apostolic Episcopate and regretted that none of their bishops would join the movement. They admitted the evils of a church without Episcopal supervision, but owing to the deep-seated corruption of the Church of Rome, from which there must be escape, they concluded that necessity justified their course. That the order was not refounded later from authentic sources elsewhere, which could have been controlled, was due to political necessity. Princes were jealous of the power of the older bishops, and indeed the old line was objectionable, and not only on account of the misuse of power. Luther, and his co-labourers, had a mighty task in undertaking the cleansing of the mediæval Church.

"We, with others, believe in the Apostolic Succession, which is in fact but another name for Christian unity and which is simply an expression of the doctrine that the Church is Divine. We all link ourselves historically in some way with the past by some form of succession or ecclesiastical descent. Most of us require that our ministry shall be ordained, particularly by the laying on of hands as in apostolic times, and by some one already in an authentic line. My friend Presbus does this and he has, as he claims, a strict line of succession.

"There is another brother here, not yet heard, Method,

whose Church maintains a complete line of bishops, more complete than with us. We are so governed only in a few smaller countries. His whole American Church is under Episcopal supervision. In his Church ordination is always at the bishop's hands. There are three orders in his ministry and there is a separate ordination for each. His line is not recognised by Anglic, because, by his own confession, there is a break in it, due to the intolerance of those from whom he came. The founder of his Church saw the need of Episcopal superintendence and forced himself to exercise Episcopal powers in ordering his missions. That break is easily remedied. All that is necessary is the desire on both sides.

"I may say for at least some of my brethren, for I regret to say that we are not a unit, that though we here hold to a succession through non-Episcopal lines, we may be willing to recover a more especial order of bishops from our own sources elsewhere."

"Who is this Method?" asked the Moderator. "We would that he be called."

A man stepped forward whose appearance gave the impression that though at ease with lowly people he was in no wise abashed in any presence. There was a sociability in his manner and a genuineness in his plain words which invited confidence.

"I am the man," were his first words of self-introduction. "What do you wish me to say?"

"Is what has been said of you by Luthrem true?"

"Undoubtedly."

"To whose intolerance do you owe your origin?"

Anglic here spoke:

"To ours, Sire, and we speak it with sorrow. If our ancestors, in an age when the Church was sleeping and indifferent, had had but a few words of brotherly kindness for those in her own midst who, for her own good, wished to waken her and show her her duty, this unnecessary schism would have been avoided. And what a great Church

ours would be could we again be united. The correctness of purpose which has always characterised these people would be a great gain to us. What a loss we suffered when we allowed them to separate themselves from us. It was against the wishes of their earnest leader that they did so. He always remained with us. It was our fault, all ours."

"And you wish to undo the evil?"

"Would to God, Sire, that we could, but the time is past when we could do so effectively."

"Is it not your wish, Method, that you should again be as one with Anglic?"

"In a limited way, and on general principles, yes, but I do not wish it more than I desire to be at peace with all Christians. When we were small in numbers and unimportant it mattered. Now we can hold our own."

"And do you not even wish to mend this break in your governing line of which Luthrem speaks?"

"Of what matter is that? We are satisfied. We have now an honourable history behind us and we are doing the Lord's work effectually. Anglic says it matters to him, but to us it is of no moment."

"Not even for the unity of a divided Church?"

"As to unity, my Church has always held the simple and broad doctrine that all who acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour constitute the one body of which He is head. Existing conditions, however, are far from satisfactory. I use the words of our own bishops when I say that the divided and discordant state of Christendom awakens with us, as with other Christians, great solicitude. It indicates, as we believe, serious defects in Christian knowledge and character, and it interposes great obstacles to the progress of Christianity. At the base of these divisions doubtless lie the inevitable limitations of the human intellect. Men cannot think alike. There are honest differences of opinion. But there is also alienation where charity ought to abound. There are wrong judgments one

of another. There is a great waste of men and money. There is dishonour to the Prince of Peace.

"We do not think it possible to reach an organic union of Christians by assuming the non-church status of all Christian bodies which ignore or reject this Apostolic Succession. If that phrase is intended to designate only a form of Church government which has had wide extension through many centuries, it is unobjectionable. But if it is to cover a claim to an exclusive church status for churches which allege the unbroken descent of their bishops from the consecrating hands of the Apostles, then are we solemnly bound to deny and reject such claim and to disuse the misinterpreted phrase. And this by manifold consideration; by the silence of the New Testament as to any such identifying mark of a Christian Church; by the genius itself of Christianity, which evermore subordinates letter and form to spirit, and endless genealogies to charity; by the testimony of early ecclesiastical history as to the actual constitution of the primitive churches; by the dangers which inhere in a concession of exclusive sacramental power to the clergy, which dangers have their logical culmination in the enormous pretensions of the papacy and its arrogance towards all Protestant communions, even toward those which affect claims like its own; and by the failure of the churches which dignify themselves by these claims to transcend, not to say equal, other churches in their contributions to the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God."[1]

"Objector has already been heard on this subject," remarked the Moderator.

"Not entirely, Sire. I think that Anglic, the representative of the smallest body of Christians in this land has assurance to ask all others to walk into his parlor and be swallowed, as the fly. He wants to play whale and let us play Jonah. Not much. Does he think that the clergy of the land are going to agree to something which will stultify

[1] From Address of Methodist Bishops at Conference in Chicago, 1900.

themselves, and admit that their own ordination is illegal, at the dictation of this one small foreign body? Besides, his own people, small in numbers as they are, are not agreed among themselves, either as to the importance of this Historic Episcopate, or in what it consists. Let them first be united before saying what we should do. If the figment of this Historic Episcopate——"

"Take care, my brother," said Greatheart, who had noticed an uneasiness on the part of Charity. "For your own sake I hope the Moderator will allow me to remind you that Protest was silenced for words not more unseemly."

"It is not seemly," said the Moderator, "to characterise as a 'figment' any earnest belief of a fellow Christian. We hope the warning is sufficient."

"If you will permit," said Anglic, "I would answer the brother. As to the comparison by size, the brother has reference to numbers only, without regard to importance. He also has a defect already mentioned. He cannot see beyond our own shores. In this twentieth century an overwhelming majority of Christendom approves of the Historic Episcopate.[1]

[1] The Schaff–Herzog *Encyclopedia* gives 81 per cent. of entire Christendom as Episcopal. For fifteen centuries the history of Christianity is the history of Episcopacy, and the history of Episcopacy is the history of Christianity. They are one and inseparable. Examine the nineteenth century, and of 477,000,000 Christians in the world, nearly 400,000,000 testify to the same facts brought out by the first fifteen centuries. Go to Whitaker's *English Almanack* (1894), and see what the Anglican bishops, who make the appeal for unity, represent. Religious statistics of the English-speaking peoples of the world show:—

Episcopalians	28,750,000
Methodists of all descriptions	18,500,000
Roman Catholics	15,300,000
Presbyterians of all descriptions	12,000,000
Baptists, of all descriptions	9,200,000
Congregationalists	6,100,000
Freethinkers of various kinds	5,000,000
Unitarians of various kinds	2,500,000
Minor Religious Sects	5,000,000

"I might dwell upon its intrinsic worth as a system of government. It can be proved to have been the bulwark of defence for individual liberty through the ages as against tyranny on one side and anarchy on the other. But you are more interested to know if the facts of history justify the claim made in our appeal to Christendom for unity, which with the Scriptures, the creeds, and the sacraments include the Historic Episcopate as one of the essentials to such unity. Not presuming to speak from God's standpoint, but speaking from man's point of view, fact precedes theory,—precedes dogma. Man existed before any theory of his existence was formed. The Church of God of the old dispensation existed a thousand years before the Canon of the Old Testament was completed. And so the Incarnation was a fact before there was any theory of the Incarnation. The Crucifixion was a fact before there was any theory of the Crucifixion, and so, too, with the Resurrection. So the Christian Church with her ministry was a fact long before any theory existed as to the Church or her ministry. It existed many years before a line of the New Testament was written. It existed at least three hundred years before the Canon of the New Testament was completed.

"All Christendom practically accepts the Early Church as a sufficient witness to establish the authenticity of the Scriptures and the validity of the two Sacraments as gen-

---

Lutheran, German, or Dutch	2,500,000
Of no particular religion	16,000,000

This appeal comes therefore from the largest body of English-speaking Christians, ten millions larger than any other, to say nothing of those of other tongues in which the percentage in favour of Episcopacy is so much greater. Then remember that the Anglican Communion is a unit. The Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Baptists are divided into hundreds of subdivisions. These facts point to Episcopacy as a conserving, constructing, unifying system, while non-Episcopacy seems to be disintegrating, disorganising, destructive. The Christian world has never been united except under the Historic Episcopate. The Reformation was not aimed at the Historic Episcopate but at that abuse of it which led to tyranny.—Silas McBee, in *The Churchman*, New York.

erally necessary to salvation, and differentiated from the many pious customs of early days, the creeds, the keeping of the first day instead of the seventh, and the practice of infant baptism. Why, then, discredit the witness as to the Historic Episcopate when the testimony as to the fact of Episcopal government is just as clear and rests upon as sure foundation as the testimony to any of the above facts.[1]

"But I have generalised. I must more particularly answer, as I had intended, the remarks of Objector.

"He says that we are not agreed among ourselves, either as to the importance of the Historic Episcopate or even as to what it is. We have undoubtedly diverse beliefs in our communion as to the doctrinal significance or Divine authority of the institution, but no scholar or critic has been able as yet to disprove the Episcopate as a historic fact, and it is as a historic fact only that we urge its claims in this connection. It is our glory that we allow these diverse opinions without casting out all who differ. We do not try to improve on the Creator who made men of diverse natures. But in practice, when after consultation and argument the Church speaks through its delegated authorities, these diverse beliefs give way to the teachings of the Church. Then those who cannot accept such teachings go out from us, and I trust we wish them God's welfare. They are still part of the Christian Church and not lost to the service of God. The brother has claimed that we are comparable to the whale of biblical imagery. We hope he will not so consider us. We do not presume to discriminate adversely against any of God's servants, whom our Church, at no time, directly or indirectly, has attempted to condemn. That is God's province."

Objector again spoke:

"I still insist that Anglic is the whale and he is not so accommodating as the biblical animal. He wants me and all others like me, to disappear entirely and permanently

[1] Silas McBee.

in his organisation. How else can we interpret his acts? Here is a man, one of us, who has served God in his ministry for say twenty-five years. God has blessed his work. His ministry appears efficacious. Scores can testify that he has brought comfort to the afflicted, blessed the house of mourning, pointed the dying to the Lamb of God, and led the burdened soul to its Saviour. The spirit of God has blessed his ministrations. Then doubts arise and he is persuaded by Anglic that his ministry is not authorised. He goes to Anglic who demands that he shall be again ordained by more orderly hands, and stultify himself by confessing before all men that he has been a rash and sacrilegious profaner, and that he has undertaken to do what he had no right to do. This is more than can be expected of human pride. And if he does not do as directed, Anglic says that he must on no account be allowed to instruct the portion of God's people contained in this exclusive Church."

"May I say a word, Sire?" requested Militant, who had been a most attentive listener to this argument. "Why should he be allowed to instruct them? Why should a man who has been trained in the duties of an officer of one arm of the service, be allowed to instruct those who belong to another? If he wants to do so should he not first take the proper instructions and be properly authorised? That would be nothing against him as an officer in his former service. It would only show that he understood the regulations. Objector also in effect says that Anglic has a pride of his corps and wishes to keep up its traditions. Good for him. That is only for the good of the whole service. Even if Anglic were to say that all others were no account soldiers unless they belonged to his corps, what 's the odds? It 's a good corps, as far as it goes. It does not go far enough in my opinion. Romanus is in a better corps,—better in efficient discipline. There are but few officers in other commands, however, who care to exchange into it, but that is because they are afraid of the gibes of their fellows in their old commands."

"Peace, good Militant," said the Moderator, "we understand your opinions. From your point of view they are good, but all do not stand where you do."

"Mr. Moderator, allow me to speak but one word more." The request came from Protest who had been silenced.

"Kindly allow it," begged Greatheart and the request was seconded by Charity.

The permission was given and Protest proceeded:

"I, with thousands of Christians, which number includes the most learned and intelligent, believe that this so-called Historic Episcopate is utterly baseless. There is no Historic Episcopate.[1] Anglic's Church is governed by bishops and mine is not. This is the difference but what does it matter? This magnificent Church of Anglic, as he regards it, makes but a poor showing here. His Church is kept away from the mass of distinctly American people because it follows too closely a foreign model. And its preposterous claims also keep it separate. It is separated from us by its impudent impotence and by its impotent impudence. Need we wonder at its smallness? Its members should understand that the American Church consists of all the Christian churches in America. If Anglic wants other churches to unite with his, he must first of all abandon his nonsensical theory of Apostolic Succession."

Protest here stopped as if conscious that he might have gone too far.

During the progress of this lengthy discussion, and more and more as it progressed, it was noticeable that all the members of the Commission, including even the presiding officer, showed symptoms of weariness. The seeming impossibility of concord as shown by the divergent views, was more and more apparent until the climax was reached in the closing remarks of Protest. Those who had been upholding the differing sides of the argument were sorely tried and at times an outbreak of unseemly human passion was

[1] Charles F. Deems.

imminent. The danger was greater as the tension increased with the language of each succeeding witness.

When Protest paused, the Moderator suspended the proceedings and deep silence ensued. Many were greatly troubled lest the all-important hearing should here end ignominiously without result. All eyes were upon the Moderator and his celestial assistants. At length a motion was made by one of them and it was feared that this was the signal for the withdrawal of those composing the august tribunal.

It was at once apparent however that the movement was not made by the directing head but by angelic Peace. He stood majestically, then gently advanced to the vacant space in front of the presiding officer and faced the vast assemblage, unrebuked by his superior. There he paused but said not a word. Raising his hands and arms he still stood silent. Then his fellow, Charity, arose and stood beside him. Almost instantly the tension was relieved. The anxious looks gave place to genial smiles. Men again spoke one with the other.

"It is the spirit of Peace that is among us. That is what we feel," said Greatheart.

"The spirit of Peace," repeated Anglic.

"The spirit of Peace," reiterated Method, grasping the hand of Anglic.

"The spirit of Peace," echoed Luthrem.

"The genuine spirit of Peace," said Presbus. "It is in our hearts and I am rejoiced. These Divine beings must think hardly of us, but how can they understand us mortals?" And the tension was finally dissipated when, as the smiles broadened, he added by way of apology, "Sire, we are as tricky as mules. You do not understand us. And the harder we fight the better friends we are afterwards. Give us plenty of rope and we hang ourselves and save other people the trouble."

KAPPA

By their Fruits ye shall Know them

THE critical point safely passed, Greatheart felt encouraged to speak and to request that the last witness, Method, be again heard, this time more particularly on his own behalf. The suggestion was opportune. Method's geniality was needed as a diversion.

"Tell us of your Church, Method," commanded the Moderator. "Is it one that you call ancient?"

"It is not, my dear Sir—" Method stopped with a self-conscious, doubtful air.

"Proceed, Method," said the Moderator. "It is not necessary to defend our dignity, but if it were, it would not be injured by familiarity from such as you, who are about the business of Him who sent us. Our Master, whom we represent, while not wanting in dignity was lowly in nature, and respect was shown Him more by inward intention than in words."

"Thank you, shall I say—Sire? The word is unusual to my daily habit. Not, however, that I object. Sire it shall be, for I note the eminent example of your colleagues.

"My Church is not ancient, possibly some two centuries as an organised body, but it is truly American and, by ancestry, at ease with those of the English tongue. But in the hundred years just passed we have made wonderful progress. Allow me, kind Sir, to use our usual terms in which I shall be understood. Without them, speaking as I am wont, man to man, my native tongue incommodes me."

"As you will, Method."

"Then, a century ago, good Sir, the Mississippi, one of our central rivers, was our western boundary, and less than four hundred thousand of our people, not including Indians, lived west of the Alleghanies, a not distant range of mountains. In all the land there was no power loom, no power press, no large manufactory of textiles, wood, or iron, no canal, no railway, or steam vessel, no telegraph, no telephone. Intercommunication was difficult and ignorance led to narrowness. But our Methodist preachers had begun their wonderful work. There were less than three hundred of them all told, and a membership of just a little more than 60,000. A sparsely settled country, prevailing poverty, and the vast and exhausting range of circuit work, prevented anything but the simplest organisation of Church life. But now what a mighty change! The 60,000 communicants have grown to 6,000,000; so that whilst our population has increased fourteenfold, the Methodist churches in their membership have increased a hundredfold. A Church literature has been created, schools have been built by the hundred, and the hospitals have done their beneficent work."

"All this is truly pleasant as we were led to expect by what has been said of you," commented the Moderator. "Proceed, Method, we would hear you further."

"But it is the interior and spiritual view of that century of Church life, good Sir, if you will allow me to use the words of our Church rulers, which profoundly move the thoughtful soul. Spiritual results, indeed, admit no arithmetical measurement. We cannot even approximately estimate them. What multitudes for whom Christ died have through this ministration been saved from sin, and enriched and ennobled for the service of this present life! What comforts of patience, sweetness, and hope have been conveyed to innumerable weary and saddened souls! How have earthly homes been purified and exalted into the image of the heavenly! How many dull and narrow intel-

lects have been enlightened and enlarged for world-wide uses by the ministry of the pulpit, the school, and the press! What quickening and aid have been brought to other churches through freer and truer interpretation of the Christian scheme! What contributions have been made by a Church coeval with the republic, to civic virtue and order! And what uncounted companies of our translated friends now before the throne are triumphant witnesses for the work of the hundred years!"[1]

"This man and his fellows, Moderator," again interrupted the abrupt Militant, "belong to a very necessary portion of the Church's army. Their very name in its original derivation stands for an effective military system, and, so far as they follow it, they are effective. Their chief officers, though irregular perhaps according to Anglic, have more absolute power than those of Anglic or perhaps than any except in the Church of Rome. They have power to set up one man or put down another such as exists nowhere else by Church law. As part of the army these Methods are the scouts. They are the vanguard, the 'rousing' wing. They are very necessary. An army to be effective must have differing classes of service for differing work. But these people are impulsive and need the supervision their regulations call for. In religion they are the opposite of a machine. If we were to consider them as a machine, I should say they needed the balance wheel of their Mother Church."

"Their Mother Church," said Anglic," would be only too ready to supply the balance if there is such need and if it were agreeable to them. I have already given my opinion as to this brother. I would add that there is something about a good, sincere Methodist that I like. Some of them are a little too noisy perhaps. I do not care for that. A little, too, what we call 'fresh,' but more often than not the noisy fellow is the most whole-souled of the lot. He appears as if he

[1] From the Address of Methodist Bishops at Chicago Conference, 1900.

really took a personal interest in you. He tries to push men along in the world. If he sees a chance that he can do a good turn, put something in a man's way, he does not wait to be asked to do it, but he offers to do it. That seems like practical Christianity. As I have said, it was a great loss to our Church when we lost those our fellows and I wish we could have them back. It would be a great gain to us. They should, if any should, come back to their father's house and claim their birthright.[2] We have been reminded here that in our Father's house are many mansions so that those of dissimilar tastes may live together peaceably. Our Church is of similar build, with accommodations for all kinds, so that there need be no interferences, though dissimilar peoples may dwell under one roof."

"Now proceed, Method," commanded the Moderator. "You should be protected from the interruptions of these well-meaning but irrepressible people."

"The interruptions are welcome, Sir," replied Method, "as showing a kindly interest. The work our ancestors did was much needed and it has accomplished at least as much within the Church of Anglic since we left it as we have done outside of it. Our movement has spread throughout the world, and to Evangelical Christianity it is practically what Jesuitism was to Roman Catholic Christianity. As to size we outnumber Romanists and Anglicans combined. It would seem as if we had an implied Divine sanction."

"Does Method claim," asked Objector, "that increase in numbers implies Divine sanction? If so how does he account for the infidel Turk who once overran Christendom?"

"I have friends here, Sir, who will differentiate between us and a scourge sent by God when needed for the punishment of wrong.

"I, Sir, am a Methodist for one reason because I am an American and the Methodist Church is peculiarly adapted

[2] *The Churchman.*

to American institutions. As for irregularity of commission, owing to the breach in our line of superiors, we did only what necessity compelled and only what had before been done in the Early Church, under like necessity. What was then done has since been recognised as regular by all. As for our desire for union, I would say that in America a century ago, when we were not so prosperous, we tried to secure a reunion with our former brethren, but we were repulsed.

"In form of belief we are liberal. In fact with us the godly conduct of our members is of more importance than technical questions of doctrine, the truth of which in my opinion no one knows but God.

"At the present time we show more broad mindedness than formerly. Many of us have returned to the forms and ceremonies of worship of our Mother Church, which we never condemned but which fell into disuse. Such are ours by right. We have always had set forms for certain ceremonies. We did not disapprove of a distinctive clerical dress. We are now encouraging beauty in worship, particularly in pictorial art, music, and Church architecture, as all tending to increased reverence for holy things. We do not entirely despise, as we once did, a written form of prayer, which to my mind is often more edifying than the ravings of an incompetent minister."

"Here 's where I come in," said a new voice.

"It is my brother, Radic," said Method.

"Surnamed Hothead," added that person.

"Shall he be heard, Method? You have the present right."

"By all means, Sir. He is my brother. We differ, but he is a conscientious man. It will do you good to hear him."

"What is it you wish to offer, Radic?"

"I wish to express my entire dissatisfaction with the opinions of this man Method, who is my brother but whom, unfortunately, I cannot control. I object strongly to his approval of set forms in Church ceremonies."

"My brother," said Method, "you hold to the most rigid formalism that can possibly be, in which there is nothing but form, in fact without the substance you approve of the barest outline and you insist upon it most formally."

"My brother knows what I mean," returned Radic. "It is not worth while to bandy words with him. Above all I abhor praying to God Almighty out of a printed book, using the words of some one else. How can he know what I want to say? Besides it is not according to Holy Writ. What did Peter do when he was sinking? Did he go ashore and get a prayer-book? No, he cried out, extemporaneously as it were, 'Save, Lord, or I perish.'[1] Under cold formalism we have lost spirituality. We used to meet, man to man, in our classes, each under the personal supervision of some godly man who watched over our conduct and corrected us when needed. These classes are gone. I want them back. Our prayer-meetings are no longer the power they were because men are ashamed to talk to God in public; or perhaps from want of practice men have lost the ability. Our preachers come and stay with us forever, fearful of a change lest they may get a job that pays less. I tell you we want to wake up. We want a revival, Sir,—a revival."

"May it please you, Sire," said Greatheart, "this opens up the whole question of ritual in worship, vestments, and the like, which has been a great cause of controversy. Might it please you to consider that subject especially, as you did that of the historic ministry?"

"In time, Greatheart. Everything in its order. We are not yet through with Method in that we have not yet seen the particular bearing of his testimony on the main object of this inquiry."

"Once let me loose," said Radic, "and I will show you what the bearing is. The bearing is that the union of sects

[1] Philip Gatch.

would be the death of spirituality. A cold uniformity would replace Christian activity. No greater curse could come upon us."

"Not so," said Method. "I at least can have no such ideas. I approve of unity. We ourselves include many separate units which could with advantage be fused together, a comparatively easy undertaking, and then we would be in a more logical position to recommend unity to those without our own body. Some of these fractures we have already healed. As for a unity with our Mother Church, that of Anglic, it is at present beyond our Christian charity. As I have said, the time is past. There is now no need so far as we are concerned. As for anything beyond Anglic, such as a unity which would include Romanus, that is inconceivable."

"Then let us consider the suggestion of Greatheart," said the Moderator, sadly, and again an atmosphere of dejection pervaded the members of the assembly.

LAMBDA

In Beauty's Name

THE depression was not relieved but rather intensified when Radic, whose words had not been the most quieting, claimed the right to be first heard in the discussion of the new question which by the decision of the Moderator was in order. He lost no time in beginning:

"This cold formalism, Sir, to which I object, which includes elaborate set services, written prayers, and read sermons, cools one's religion. I want to get near to God. I want to go to no meeting where I do not feel enough at home not to have to consider regulations. If in my eagerness for the object of my coming I happen to lay my hat on the communion table, what harm is it? It is but a piece of wood. God is not there. I do no affront to Him. When I pray, my thoughts do not wander if I keep my eyes shut to keep out distractions. How can I do that when I have to read, particularly the uninspired effusions of some old sinner who perhaps is himself in Hell. I don't want distractions in pictures painted by ungodly men for money, nor do I want to listen to fine music in which I cannot participate. My emotions are best stirred when I can take an active part myself."

"The brother," said Greatheart, "does not approve of beauty in worship, effective in line and colour, in building or decoration, or in representations in art, nor in music. He does not yet know that his emotions can be as deeply stirred but in a different way, by listening to good music as

in taking part. Both methods have good in them. Neither should be neglected. Does he expect to go to Heaven? So far as our advices go, there we are to have various things in worship which our brother should begin to get used to here, all in the line of beauty—grandeur, magnificence, elaborate ceremonial, gorgeous surroundings, vestments of radiant splendour, lights innumerable, overpowering music both to listen to and to take part in. Note what is written concerning angels with their harps, vocal music, melody and chorus, a new song, thrones, jewels, posturings, lamps, odours as of incense, colours, white raiment."

"But this is far from Heaven, Brother," resumed Radic. "Anglic is the only one of those I call Christians who claims to imitate it. But why do you, Greatheart, like his millinery?"

"I can give no other reason than that I like it. It is inborn, as it is in many."

"You are misled, Greatheart. You should not let your earthly nature subordinate the spiritual. Keep yourself free. As for Anglic, he is unimportant in numbers and influence. In my opinion, if the Protestant sects of our country were able to combine they would not seriously miss him and his friends from the large and efficient organisation.[1] So far as his ritual is concerned, I say beauty be hanged. It is all rot."

"And what about the forms used by Romanus?" asked Greatheart.

"Pure idolatry. Unchristian. Out of the question altogether. Never consider it. But as to mere formalism, like that of Anglic, I prefer good, straight preaching, instruction, hits at you straight from the shoulder. Let it jar you. That 's better for Christian life than all your services, even if it does include only hymns and prayers and Scripture readings. Preaching is the crowning function. Without that there is no service."

[1] *Christian Secretary* (Baptist).

"Brother Radic, have you never felt the power of an elaborate service without regard to the preaching?" said Greatheart. "Have you never followed Anglic to some great cathedral-like building? How fine and massive are those towers and buttresses; how that spire soars to Heaven! You enter and see the lofty windows with their rich colouring; the solid pillars, like the very props of a world; the long-drawn aisle echoing to the footsteps of worshippers. You sit with a great congregation; the organ peals forth its thrilling melody, the choir sings with voices skilfully trained, and the people may join in the song, when it is like the sound of many waters."

"Yes, Brother Greatheart," said Radic. "I 've been there. And then the preacher rises, a fine presence, robed in costly gown and decorated with university emblems. What a voice! How it sounds through the great building, every syllable distinctly enunciated! What an easy pleasant action and gesture. But bless your dear heart, he has nothing to say; it is voice and nothing else. You hide your face with shame of the man. I do not see how any man with a message to deliver can let such an opportunity slip to reach the ears of the very people he should want to reach, and at a time when they would give him undivided attention if he only had something to say. Leave the cathedral and go down a back street, find a mission chapel, pass into a very humble hall. The poor, weak organ suggests the reflection that it is well it has no more power—for there is enough of it such as it is; a very wobbly choir tries to piece out the deficiencies of the organ and does not succeed. The last sound is the welcome one. Then rises the plain preacher, in plainest garb, and with a thin voice. But in three sentences you find that you have to do with a man, and a man who sees the thing and can tell what he sees, and so tell it that every fibre of your being responds to it. Your whole soul goes out to welcome it; you are lifted beyond yourself, and see God, and feel duty, and know immortality. Oh, great is the preacher!"

"I think," said Objector, "that our Anglican friends are surely to blame because they do not combine all attractions to bring in the people. They surely slight a great one when they neglect preaching and depend on display. How can they expect thinking intelligent people to sit still and hear the commonplaces that they hand out as sermons, which any schoolboy could excel. I leave it to any business man if it is not business sense not to depend on any one article to draw his trade but have a complete stock of everything good. There are thousands of such practical business men here. They are here, Sir, because they are interested in Christ's Church and because they believe in Church unity as a business proposition. Would you, Sir, do me the favour to question one of them?"

"I am such a man," said a well-kept, prosperous looking person, who arose to be questioned. "I agree with my friend entirely. I am but a plain business man, but I say bring the people in by all means and by anything they like. Good preaching fills the bill almost anywhere. Millinery helps. They all use something, but nothing should be neglected. Romanus uses faked miracles. The Salvationist works like a 'barker' or a policeman. Method uses revivals. Presbus preaches to a lantern show when he has no other ideas. All these things are effective with a certain class. But let me say here, while I have the chance, that of all business follies, this division of Christendom is the worst. Outside of the waste, which is what gets me, it is most ridiculous. This is what it reminds me of. I once read of a Russian Czar who, after his coronation, was received with a most gorgeous procession in which were the most magnificent costumes, the most brilliant music, innumerable troops, throngs of enthusiastic subjects. Animals from the zoölogical gardens were brought to add interest and splendour to the pageant. The lions and elephants and horses walked as if they appreciated the dignity of the occasion. But there was one cage of insignificant animals called the happy family. These little animals—

cats and little dogs and monkeys—were absorbed in their little mean quarrels, or play. They fought and frisked and greedily gathered up their food and climbed over each other's heads, while the band played the Russian national hymn and the stately procession moved on to meet the Czar.[1] Now we are such a happy family. We are supposed to be put here to glorify God Almighty. But we are so busy scrapping and squealing among ourselves that we can't see how it looks from the outside. We can't see beyond our own cage."

"That's the point," said Greatheart. "We want you, Sire, to let us out of the cage, so we can see outside."

"Or make us all cats or all monkeys or all elephants, so we can agree," said Objector. "Our environment here is too close for so many varieties."

"That is the main point," said Anglic. "Our environment is too small. But the drawback of that is not the close quarters, but because it prevents us from seeing beyond our own shores. It is this ignorance of the Church throughout the world that narrows us. I could prove that this ignorance exists by this successful business man here, who is interested in our problems. He says we are not business-like. But I am sure he knows nothing of what makes us so —of the causes of our difficulties. I venture to say he has never heard of such men as Wycliffe, Cranmer, or Ridley."

"Who are they, may I ask?" queried the business man. "I have heard the names. Seems to me I saw them on a monument somewhere in my travels. I could not leave long enough to do everything thoroughly you know. What happened to them?"

"They were burned for their faith, as were many other good and worthy fellows both like and unlike them," replied Anglic.

"Burned? That's bad. Where was this?"

"You have the proof, Sire," said Anglic. "We need

[1] Robert S. Barrett.

enlarged environment and greater knowledge. While I am on my feet I wish to say that it is hardly necessary in this assembly to dwell upon the advantages of our set forms of prayer. They are too well known and appreciated. They have stood the test of centuries. Ours has been called the Church of the prayer-book as if we hold that a book of Divine appointment. We do not, though it is of inestimable value. In our fourfold offer to other churches which contained what we considered the essentials, nothing was said of ritual. Our prayer-book is a guide and a standard. It protects from error. It gives us truth in its entirety. No matter what our ministers may declare, it sets us right. The worship of God under human guidance often runs to indifference or contempt, often to a shocking familiarity with the Deity. This book gives us reverence, that of the Apostles and early disciples."

" Yes," said the business man, "I agree with him there. It ain't the right kind of goods for the trade that some of them hand out in prayers. I once went to a wedding conducted by an extemporaneous parson who in his prayer used the words, 'We thank Thee Lord, that Thou has given us wumman to make us koomfortable,' and after about a half hour of other petitions added, 'And now O Lord we will relate an anecdote.'[1] That was familiarity for you."

"And if you had questioned that very extemporaneous parson," resumed Anglic, "I am sure he would have testified to the burdens which are borne by such as he, in their efforts that their prayers may be acceptable to God and edifying to man, which drawbacks are unknown to those trained in a liturgical service, who have given to them the very words which will most readily ascend to Heaven."[2]

[1] *St. Andrew's and Elsewhere*, A. K. H. Boyd.

[2] I knew a saintly minister, one of the greatest and best in Scotland. Each Sunday morning he went to church under an awful burden of misery, through his anxiety about his extempore prayers. He was unutterably miserable in the vestry before service. He was miserable while the opening Psalm was being sung. He was miserable when he

"I agree with Anglic on this subject," said Conservative, "possibly at the expense of disagreeing with my own brother, Presbus. I hold that a hatred of forms is no part of the oldest and best forms of Presbyterianism. So far as I am personally concerned I think that one of the most feasible ways of promoting Church unity is for us to adopt, as we can most readily, the most beautiful liturgical forms of the Church of Anglic. They are in our own language, they have the halo of age and authenticity, and they insure against mediocrity in ministration. No ignorance can entirely ruin a service based on the prayer-book. Its use would accustom us to look with less disfavour upon the Church of the prayer-book, and in fact in the common use

---

stood up to begin his first prayer. But he took the Psalm which had been sung for his theme; and he tried to cast himself on God's help; and gradually the burden lifted and he got on heartily with his prayer and peace came to him. I looked at the beautiful face, and I thought, if the burden of conducting public worship according to our Order lies so awfully upon a saint like you, with a record of half a century, what ought it to be for me, going each morning to minister to a great congregation of educated folk and to pray in their name. Not but what it lay heavily enough, for in those days the Morning Prayers were *bona fide*, extemporised and continually varied; one went to church under great nervous tension; but it was not quite like that morbid terror of a far better man. But I knew too well what he would have said had I suggested that he might prepare his prayers. That would have been ceasing to trust simply in the Holy Spirit. Singularly he never thought of trusting to any supernal aid in the matter of his sermons. They were carefully written and read, which appeared inconsistent. And the good man plainly thought that to go through this superfluous misery each Sunday morning was 'spending and being spent'; it was the right thing to do. Well one remembers the awful nervousness of our greatest preachers in those days in the vestry before service, and how one envied the composure of Anglican friends in the like circumstances. One would try to go through anything if the congregation were to gain vastly by the minister's suffering. But the congregation did not gain at all. The strain of conducting public worship was intensified to a breaking pitch by requirements which could add nothing to the edification of the flock, or to the beauty of worship in the house of prayer.—*A. K. H. Boyd.*

of such forms, to a large extent, we but use a common heritage."

"They are partly from our sources," said Luthrem. "We as a church approve of ancient liturgy. I must admit, however, that some of my brethren do not feel so kindly towards it, though they are learning to do so."

"It may be," said Anglic, "that the reformed Church of England is indebted for many such good things to Germany, from whence Luthrem derives them, but I think we have been more dependent on older sources, in which he has equal right if he will but assert it. And we love his hymn writers, as he does ours."

"And ours," said Method. "And I too in this do not agree with my brother, Radic. Our founder urged the use of ritual. If we are going back to it to-day we are indeed but re-appropriating something belonging to us which for a time we imagined valueless."[1]

"I had not finished, Sire," said Conservative. "With your permission I shall do so. I believe that our opposition to a liturgy has been a mistake. While we do not desire to have forms of prayer made obligatory, we do think that their use ought to be encouraged. In theory an extempo-

[1] And I have prepared a liturgy, little differing from that of the Church of England (I think the best constituted national church in the world), which I advise all the travelling preachers to use on the Lord's day in all the congregations, reading the Litany only on Wednesdays and Fridays, and praying extempore on all other days. I also advise the elders to administer the Supper of the Lord on every Lord's day.—From *Letter from John Wesley to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and other brethren in North America.*

We agreed to form a Methodist Episcopal church [in America] *in which the liturgy* (as presented by the Rev. John Wesley) *should be read*, and the sacraments be administered by a superintendent, elders, and deacons, who shall be ordained by a presbytery, using the Episcopal form as prescribed in the Rev. Mr. Wesley's prayer-book.—Phœbus's "Memoirs of Whatcote" (Italics original), from *A History of Methodists in the U. S.*, by J. M. Buckley. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

raneous prayer is to be preferred. If the person offering it is possessed of devotion and particularly if he understands the needs and aspirations of the human heart, and can express them in a petition reverent in tone, and characterised at once by good English and good taste, then it is an ideal prayer. But it may be said, indeed, that the ability to make such prayers requires as much genius as to preach a great sermon. And there are a multitude of good men who are not geniuses. And then, as has been said, occasionally there are to be heard irreverent, blasphemous, and vulgar prayers, even to listen to which seems a profanation. When the pastor of a church with such customs sees his young people straying off to the nearest Episcopal Church because they 'like the service,' he is pretty apt to ask himself why he also cannot have a service that they will like."

"I wish to say a word in this connection," said Presbus, "in reply to my brother, Conservative, with whom on this subject I do not agree. I think he is wrong in his liking for this ritual of Anglic, though it is unimportant to a soul's salvation. The important thing with us is doctrine—what we believe. But our distinctive service is being interfered with by such as he. Gradually in many of our churches, especially in our large cities, it is being modified, I will not say enriched by elaborate anthems, the *Te Deum*, responsive readings, or the chanting of the Lord's Prayer. I would not for a moment suggest that these more elaborate practices are unlawful or even inadvisable. But considerable experience has taught me that people who like these modifications at all are apt to prefer the more orderly, historic, and dignified service of Anglic. And it is quite safe to assume that he who prefers the erratic performances of our modern Presbyterian choirs, to the more solemn and regular ritual of the prayer-book, is not one who is likely to stay in the Presbyterian Church for doctrinal reasons. When, however, Presbyterian doctrine is neglected or attacked, and a mongrel Episcopalian service accompanies the preach-

ing, it is difficult to see that there is any grave reason for the existence of our Presbyterian Church."[1]

"I can't see the necessity for all this discussion," observed Militant. "It is all a question of drill. Of course all corps cannot use the same forms. They must suit the particular kind of work for which they are intended. No more could a naval squadron and an army division use the same formations."

"But of all men," said Anglic, "my military friend does not despise display. We may call it the love of the æsthetic. That he appreciates that we have this love is one of the wisdoms of Romanus. It is in the age. Even our business-man is paying attention to the ornamental in goods and advertisements. Colleges cultivate glittering ceremonial. All branches of the Church are feeling the movement. Men like Radic and Presbus are holding back. Rome, skilled in human nature, whatever she may know of Divine, is making use of this inherent human craving for ceremonial. She does this grotesquely at times, and perhaps at times her taste is questionable artistically, but it is generally as refined as conditions demand. But there is human appeal in her practices. Men do not discriminate. Many who disparage her here, go annually to her native home and return converts in heart to a need of better presentation of Christian facts. We should help to satisfy this natural impulse for æsthetic satisfaction. I have a brother in the faith, here present, his name is Earnest, who feels more deeply on this subject than I do, for he has given it special thought and his practice follows his convictions. Would you kindly hear him?"

"Call Earnest," said the Moderator.

"I am at hand as needed," answered one who outwardly could hardly be distinguished from Romanus except that a more well-kept mien suggested a home where the loving hands of women ministered, and a woman's eye watched the outward appearance.

[1] John James McCook.

"May it please your Excellency," said Romanus, "I know this brother, my close imitator, well. He causes us no worry, only merriment. He calls himself priest, which he is not, and teaches his followers to call him 'Father.' He advises them to disregard their own laws. His Communion Service he tries to make a sacrifice, as with us, of the true body and blood of our Lord. He pays unnecessary reverence to elements which are but elements. His lamps, incense, embroideries, crucifixes, and genuflections are meaningless. His own people know not how to worship with him, for his methods are not theirs, and his own ecclesiastical superiors condemn him, with his holy water, his confessional, his tabernacle, and his elevations."

Earnest stood unmoved by the remarks of Romanus. When he had opportunity he said:

"It is true, Sire, that I may be an unworthy representative of my class. My impetuosity, due to my deep convictions, may lead to advanced ideas, not popular with some of my brethren. As my opinion is asked, I would say that all the outward observances of Rome, unconnected with modern false doctrine, or claims of supremacy, are of great value to the devout Christian. Why should she be allowed to monopolise the good things, which in fact are as much ours as hers? Our reformers went too far in rejecting unessential things of value as if they were connected with error in the faith. We should use all the external helps possible, beauty in music, painting, sculpture, suitable vestment, or ceremonial, whereby no sense which God has given us, of the eye or ear, taste or smell, may be neglected as a means to an end. Our Church in these things should be in no degree inferior to Rome. Nor should our prejudices hinder us from the use of a good thing simply because it is included in the usage of Rome. But some of my brethren, who accuse me of copying Rome, themselves do so unwittingly and to their detriment. For instance, I cannot approve of those of my own faith who object to a canonised saint but virtually canonise one of their own number,

Brother So-and-So, whose disorderly revivals may please them. They like a withdrawing-room meeting, better than an orderly church service, or certain devotional exercises, which they call a prayer-meeting, better than a celebration of the Holy Eucharist, which, properly observed, has been designated by great thinkers outside of our faith, the most impressive of all effective ritual."

"Do you think, Earnest," asked the Moderator, "that the adoption of a ritual as near as may be on some common model, were such a thing possible, would tend to such a unity as we are here to promote?"

"Sire, as to unity I may express the convictions, not only of such as I am, but of many whose ideas are not as advanced as are mine, those who will not by a jot go beyond the strictest interpretation of the Church's law. These, with myself, do not approve, in fact we heartily disapprove, of many things which have been done by my brethren in the effort to further this unity."

"You approve not of unity. Then why are you here?"

"To hinder, Sire, if it may be necessary."

"To hinder? Then you stand not by the offer of your Church for a unity based on your own proposals?"

"No, Sire. I have disapproved and still do. We have offered to give up too much. Were we to do as we have said we would, we would cease to be a church. We have offered to sacrifice the prayer-book, liturgy, confirmation, our articles of religion, and all those valued and endeared ecclesiastical customs and arrangements which we have been accustomed to think of as part of the very Church itself. The offer was nothing less than a proposal to commit suicide, in the hope of a vague and uncertain metempsychosis. It was suicidal in that it proposed to the Church to lose her life that she might find it again. Those suggestions have always seemed a hard saying to practical men, and the more the propositions were discussed the more doubtful it became whether the Church either would or

could stand by them in case they should be accepted by any large denomination."[1]

"That is my opinion to a dot," said Radic. "Anglic's Church is lonely. She has been looking around for some more or less real alliance with some strong body somewhere, here or elsewhere, in order to increase her prominence. But whenever anything nibbles at her bait she jerks it away lest she should catch something she might not like."

"If Radic has finished," said Earnest, "I should like to strengthen my statement by calling others of my Church who think as I do."

"You may do so," said the Moderator, but there was no joy shown in the permission given.

"Then," rejoined Earnest, "call——"

The testimony was interrupted again by the angel Peace, but this time he spoke, and the interruption was evidently to the relief of the presiding officer.

"Is this necessary, Friend Earnest? We can all understand that your love for your Church, which has many things lovable, would deter you from agreeing to anything which would deprive you of those things, and the more so according to the depth of your devotion. You doubtless can appreciate the fact that this same kind of devotion would prevent another, equally devoted to something else, from giving up the object of his affection. Why add importance to this disagreement by dwelling on it? So far no one has shown a willingness to give up anything, so it is evident that this desired unity must come by inclusion and not by exclusion. In fact to insist that everything must be given up on which all cannot agree, leaves in the end nothing. One after another will be excluded on this point or that. But," said Peace, turning to the Moderator with evident purpose to prevent a return to the unpleasant possibility suggested by Earnest, "there is one here, by

[1] S. D. McConnell.

name Luthrem, who has been partly heard, but who, if I mistake not, has your virtual promise to be heard in full."

Radic interrupted to say:

"And he is more clannish in his way than Earnest. As I read him he, in that, has inherited the traits of the Church of Romanus of which he is an illegitimate son."

"Good Peace, attend to this brother in kindness, as you alone can," said the Moderator. "He and Protest are of similar nature. We would not mar our proceedings by another prohibition."

But Radic was silent; a mere look from the gentle Peace was all that was necessary.

"Your orders are obeyed," said Peace to the Moderator.

"O Sire, we should be deeply grateful for the presence of this most kindly member of your Commission," said Greatheart. "Without this Peace we should long ago have given up discouraged. And if such a thing were possible that he could not influence us single-handed, he has but to turn to Charity, equally if not more kindly, for assistance. The two together are invincible. I tremble to think what this inquiry might have become without them. The Lord is good to have sent them with you, and knows our needs. Though I as yet see not the way in which we should go, I feel greatly encouraged because through the presence of these two we have now, for the second time, been brought back from what looked like the depths of despair."

"Let Luthrem be called," was the only observation of the Moderator.

MU

A Safe Stronghold Is Our God

"BEFORE you recall this witness," said Greatheart, "will you permit me to try to mitigate the great disappointment which we have felt in finding, by the testimony of Earnest, that the thing on which we so much depended, the offer of Anglic and his friends, is now virtually repudiated. Were it not for the kindly offices of Peace you would notice deeper dejection on our part than at any previous time. But I wish to rally my fellows by reminding them that we must do our duty and leave results to God. We cannot always see how they are to come. We plant a seed and forget that we have done so. In due time it seems to die, but behold there is life in the springing up of a new plant. These proposals of Anglic have been as the planting of the seed, and done with the best of intentions. They have apparently been without effect, but is that the fact? They may have set men to thinking. They may have been but an incident in the Divine economy, but one with its purpose, though that may not be anything immediate. God's time is not our time. If they were as seed they would require God's care, showers, dews, nights and days, and the progress of seasons. Both those who made them and those who scoffed at them may yet see that there was product. Who can say? Let us not be unduly cast down."

"I, for one, am not cast down, Brother Greatheart," said the waiting witness, Luthrem, "for I have consistently op-

posed the propositions from the beginning. I could see, as Earnest has said, that they proposed to give up too many things of great value to him, or at least make them of no account, more than he could consistently agree to give up. And the acceptance of such offers on our part would likewise involve similar sacrifices. There is probably no Church nearer to us than that of Anglic, in sympathies, in churchmanship, in reformed doctrine. His Church has had its troubles with Rome as we have had. We also approve of ritual, liturgy, reverence, beauty, and dignity in worship. Together we fought the battles of the Reformation and in my opinion his Church is more indebted to our reformers than he will allow. In a late dynasty, English rulers came from Germany and were of our faith. Under them we had recognition by his secular government. In fact in this country, during that era, we co-operated and were nearly united. My criticism of Anglic would be that he is too much of a time-server, too lenient of error, too tolerant of doctrine, too inclusive, too lax in discipline and too insistent on the peculiar system of Church government involved in his Apostolic Succession."

"It will not be many years till we shall have that also." The speaker was one not heard before. "My name is Wouldbe and I am brother to Luthrem, of his own household in fact. We belong to one of the strongest bodies of Christians, but our influence is not correspondingly great. Why? Because of the lack of a strong central government which would unite our separate units."[1]

[1] According to *The Lutheran*, the denomination which it represents may now claim the third place in the list of Protestant bodies in the land, and has first rank in New York and Chicago. We are not in a position to criticise these figures, but we believe that there is much to substantiate their claim to the largest proportionate increase amongst all denominations. It has to be borne in mind that these figures do not belong to any one corporate body, for the Lutherans are divided into numerous bodies, partly differing on theological and ecclesiastical lines (High and Low Church) and partly separated by geographical boundaries. Unlike their German ancestors, who were great haters of

"We can at any time," said Luthrem, "call some of our clergy by another name, relieve them of the work of congregations, and make them effective in a business way as superintendents, as Method has done with marked success."[1]

---

schism, they do not seem conscious of the weakness caused by these unhappy divisions, and yet this must be the secret of the reason why the Lutherans exert so little influence in the country as compared with their figures.

The size of this immense denomination is due to the numerous sources which naturally contribute to its ranks. Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Iceland, and even Finland, all feed its growth through an enormous immigration, and there is no other Church in the country, with the exception of the Roman Catholic, which has such an historical advantage. In the West there are several large consistories of Scandinavians, even an American Icelandic Church. It seems a pity that there is no remedy yet found to quell this ecclesiastical Babel.

If our [Anglican] Church were to choose any one body with which to cultivate friendly relations, looking towards union, none might be more suited than the Lutherans. History early separated us, and Lutherans and Anglicans soon became equally provincial in their outlook upon things; yet there was no openly expressed quarrel between them, while on the other hand there have been at different times most interesting *rapprochements* between us, as at the Reformation and again in our own century in the matter of the Jerusalem bishopric, while for America we cannot forget the early affiliations of the two churches which have enriched us with some noble parishes and some most eminent men. Sweden claims to have the Episcopate, the Evangelical Lutherans possess a rich and beautiful liturgy, and all branches claim to be more orthodox than the Episcopalians. We might there find some points of agreement.—*Church Standard.*

[1] One of the anomalies of Methodism is, that while Mr. Wesley gave his followers in England a free form of government, without bishop or presiding elders, the Methodist Episcopal Church of this country has both these officers, and is from first to last despotic in form, if not in spirit, from the lowest to the highest places of power. The preacher in charge appoints the "leaders" of the "classes"; he also nominates the "stewards"; thus, he virtually creates the "Quarterly Conference." Then the bishops appoint the presiding elders of the annual conferences, who have charge of the "districts" and constitute the bishop's "cabinet." In all this there is nothing elective, or, in a republican sense, representative.

The annual conferences elect delegates to the General Conference;

"Such was not my idea," said Wouldbe. "I would have no mere superintendence but a true diocesan Episcopate, unquestioned, such as led the Church to victory in the past, and such as our great founder himself desired. He did not

---

and the presiding elders, from their positions as "superiors in office," so far control, or at least influence, the votes of those under their charge as to secure the election of a sufficient number of their order to have the majority in the General Conference. This is the highest and the only lawmaking power in the Church; and it elects the bishops, the book agents, the editors of the different Church papers, and the officers of the missionary and other societies. The result is, that everything tends to create a self-appointing and self-perpetuating class of superiors, or Church dignitaries, with the further necessary result of a long line of subordinates and dependents upon their will. In politics we would call this a "ring"; in government we would call it anything but republican. These Church officials naturally come to love authority, and in a large sense to feel that they own the Church; that the hardworking preachers are controlled by and working for them; and that the people have only to pay the bills.

Not in Romanism itself, nor in the government of an army is there a more thorough organisation, or a more perfect equipment, with all the essentials for a strict surveillance over every individual and every department, and with power to enforce its rules, than is found in the Methodist Church of America. Fortunately for the Church and the cause of religion, the bishops have generally been conscientious men, and have sought to use their great power for good; and in a less degree the same may be said of other high officials; but the vast machinery for injustice and oppression exists, and more than once have good men felt its crushing weight.—*Confessions of a Methodist. The Forum.* New York.

It is very certain that Wesley himself, with his despotic temper and his High-church and Tory principles, could not have carried the Methodist movement in the New World onward through the perils of its infancy, on the way to so eminent a success as that which was prepared by his vicegerent [Francis Asbury]. Fully possessed of the principles of that autocratic discipline ordained by Wesley, he knew how to use it as not abusing it, being aware that such a discipline can continue to subsist, in the long run, only by studying the temper of the subjects of it, and making sure of obedience to orders by making sure that the orders are agreeable on the whole to the subjects. More than one polity, theoretically aristocratic or monarchic, in the atmosphere of our republic has grown into a practically popular government, simply through tact and good judgment in the administration of it, without changing

wish to abolish the episcopate but wished to divest it of popish conditions. Nor for such need we go out of our own communion,[1] though we need to go outside of this country. We have such an Episcopacy in a

a syllable of its constitution. Very early in the history of the Methodist Church it is easy to recognise the aptitude with which Asbury naturalises himself in the new climate. Nominally he holds an autocracy over the young organisation. Questions of the utmost difficulty and of vital importance arose in the first years of the American itinerancy. They could not have been decided so wisely for the country and the universal Church if Asbury, seeming to govern the ministry and the membership of the Society, had not studied to be governed by them. In spite of the sturdy dictum of Wesley, "We are not republicans and do not intend to be," the salutary and necessary change had already begun which was to accommodate his institutes in practice, and eventually in form, to the habits and requirements of a free people.—*L. W. Bacon.*

[1] Luther said: "The Church can never be better governed and preserved than with an episcopal government after the pattern of the apostolic and primitive Church." But notwithstanding the desire on the part of the reformers to retain the episcopate, it disappeared from some Lutheran states because the bishops did not receive the doctrines taught by the reformers, and refused to visit their churches and ordain their priests. This failure on the part of the bishops was a cause of great regret to Luther. "Now," he said, "that the Gospel has by the grace of God, been restored again, we would willingly see this true episcopal and visitation office as of the highest necessity established again." Melancthon shared the feeling of Luther. Writing to Camerarius he said: "Would to God that I were able, not indeed to confirm the worldly power of the bishops, but to restore to them the spiritual administration; for I clearly see what a Church we shall have should episcopal government be abolished. I see that afterwards there will be a worse tyranny than ever yet existed." Later on Luther complained of the interference of the civil power in the affairs of the Church, and of the injury caused by the disturbance. Both Luther and Melancthon deplored, but could not prevent the departure from episcopal government and the constant encroachments of the state in the province of the Church. Luther said: "We may see how necessary and useful the episcopal office in the Christian Church is by the evils that have occurred since it has been abolished." The reformers encouraged the continuance of the episcopate where it had not been dropped. There seems to be little doubt that the episcopate would have been retained in all the principalities receiving the evangelical doctrine, had it not been for the encroachments of the

country of our own faith. I approve of the Historic Episcopate, but we do not need to beg it from Anglic."

"But," said Luthrem, "you would build a bridge for our people to pass into the Church of Anglic."

"By no means," said Wouldbe. "There is already a bridge over which many of our people are passing. But it is a passage only one way. By having an Episcopal organisation there would be a bridge by which they would pass both ways, and we would be as likely to gain as to lose. And there are those in both communions who would rejoice to see the chasm, over which this bridge extends, filled up so that there would be nothing to separate between us, and the two would be one. And if these two churches, which have so much in common, could be united and become one—one Evangelical Church in America—what a conservative and aggressive power it would be—a power for Christ and His Kingdom—and it would be the beginning of the realisation of that unity for which our Lord prayed."[1]

"If such is your plan, friend Wouldbe," said Greatheart, "why not swallow your pride slightly, get your Episcopate from your own sources but ask Anglic's Episcopate to join with you in securing it, which would be an act of Christian courtesy. By your ideas, you do not need such help. You think that you would be no better for having it. But if you disarm all criticism on his part, and you are no worse for it by your own showing, you are in fact the gainer. Why don't you try it, Brother Wouldbe?" The earnestness of Greatheart was most apparent.

"I know not how such a wish on our part would be received by Anglic. He would probably say: 'Come with us and we will give you all we have.' But we do not wish to repudiate those of our own family, and become a stranger in a strange land."

---

state within the Church.—*The Episcopate for the Lutheran Church*, John Kohler.

[1] John Kohler.

"It is not for me to speak for my Church officially," said Anglic, "but if there were such a movement on the part of such a body of Christians as the one referred to, which here greatly outnumbers us, it should be regarded with practical sympathy. But it would be one of those delicate cases in which sympathy must not be prematurely practical, particularly when unasked. It is neither by vulgar proselyting nor by intrusive meddling with the affairs of fellow-Christians of other churches that we may expect to promote the cause of Church unity. Meanwhile, across the flimsy, decaying barrier which divides us, we would assure our friend Wouldbe of our earnest sympathy."

"I must admit," said Luthrem, "that it is a question whether the cause of true religion has been helped or hindered by the spirit of sectarianism which prevented the consolidation of these two great local churches, ours and Anglic's, in our colonial days, when they were so near together, and also whether it would not now be promoted by a consolidation which our American forefathers might have effected much more easily many years ago. But as for me personally I cannot say that I at all approve of such a general union of all Christians as is contemplated by——"

Peace interrupted to ask of the Moderator:

"Would not Luthrem kindly tell us something about his own Church, of which he justly is proud. The recital of good deeds which men have done will tend to a Christian charity which will greatly promote the object of this inquiry."

"I can tell you more of it than can he," said Objector. "I can tell him how his Church looks from the outside, which I know he as a member cannot appreciate, for I was once within it. That was at a time of ecclesiastical warfare. Its distinctive faith was in process of being lost through carelessness. It was a time for assertion and repeated assertion. But I grew tired of the monotony. I was young, impressionable, and desirous of doing great things for Christ. I heard nothing but Luther, Luther, Luther;

but where was Christ? Then as an aid to Luther, his race was extolled and his native language, at the expense of those to which I was native born, which I also resented. They were earnest and good men who thus taught me. I will tolerate no abuse of them or their Church. I cannot but feel kindly to the Church my mother belonged to."

"Our Church," said Wouldbe, "is indeed called by the name of one of the greatest and most commanding figures in the Reformation but it was not by his wish. It was first so called in derision as were the followers of Christ first called Christians. As the name clung Luther earnestly protested, and yet at the same time he warned men against such a repudiation of it as would imply a rejection of the doctrine of God's word as preached by him. He said: 'It is my doctrine and it is not my doctrine; it is in my hand but God put it there. Luther will have nothing to do with Lutheranism except as it teaches Holy Scripture purely.' It is a great mistake to suppose that our Church is bound by consistency to hold a view simply because Luther held it. Her faith is not to be brought to the touchstone of Luther's private opinion, but his private opinion is to be tested by her confessed faith when the question is, What is genuinely Lutheran? The name Lutheran, as our Church tolerates it, means no more than that she heartily accepts that New Testament faith in its integrity, in whose restoration Luther was so glorious a leader. The private opinions of individuals, however influential, can in no sense establish or remove one word of the creed of the Church.[1] Luther did not set out to reform the Church or to establish a new Church. Believing himself a true son of the Church and bound by a solemn oath to teach according to the Scriptures, he protested against prevailing errors and abuses, and was driven, little by little, by his conscience and the opposition he encountered, to the place he finally occupied, and which he never contemplated when he first lifted up his

[1] Charles Porterfield Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation.*

voice. He never for a moment doubted that he was maintaining the principles of the one holy Christian Church, as they were held in the beginning, in her purest days and by her best teachers. He took the ground that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith, and he appealed to the history of the Church and the works of the Fathers to show that the errors and abuses, against which so many had protested before his day, had crept into the Church because it neglected this rule, and men transgressed the commandment of God by their tradition, 'teaching for doctrine the commandments of men.'[1] But I am just conscious that I am usurping the place of my brother, Luthrem," said Wouldbe.

"Let Luthrem proceed," said the Moderator.

"That I will do if Objector has entirely finished."

"I have only one thing more to say," persisted Objector. "Luthrem is ashamed to say he is a Catholic. In deference to the feelings of hatred with which he regards his Mother Church he will not even use the word in his creed, fearing that his people have not sufficient familiarity with our tongue to distinguish its true meaning from the colloquial one which locally distinguishes the Church of Romanus."

The speaker was here interrupted by the Moderator.

"Friend, must we appeal to Peace to discipline you, so that Luthrem may continue?"

Pausing for a moment, and hearing nothing further from Objector, Luthrem continued:

"Our history is too lengthy to relate here, but I would like to say that Lutheranism to-day is a specific form of Christian life. It has several varieties but it is not to be confounded with particular types either of nationality or of successive development. The heart of it is Luther's doctrine of justification by faith. In the Holy Supper it has rigidly held to the literal interpretation of the words of institution, finding in the doctrine of the Real Presence the surest pledge of all that is comprehended in redemption, and

[1] George F. Krotel.

in the distribution of the heavenly object to all communicants, the seal of the individualisation of the general promise of the Gospel. Lutheranism knows of no priesthood but that of the high priesthood of Christ. Utterly repudiating the conception of the ministry as a priesthood, Lutherans, however, insist that its duties do not pertain to all believers, as do some, but only to those properly called and set apart to this work by the Church's orders. Lutheranism bows with implicit confidence to the Holy Scriptures as its sole rule of faith and liberty. It regards the Scriptures as an infallible and inerrant guide for all the purposes for which God has given us a revelation. Lutheranism has various confessions or forms of doctrine, but the confession is wholly subordinate to Holy Scripture, and the moment the confession becomes a law, it ceases to be a confession. In public worship the minister is simply the representative of the congregation. There is a carefully chosen system of lessons embodied in the Church Year. The highest act of public worship is the Lord's Supper, to which a private confession was—and still to a less extent is—a requisite preparation, though a public confession or preparatory service is now more used.[1] All this is true Lutheranism. In so far as we approach this ideal, and so far only, are we Lutherans. All else is not distinctive."

Wouldbe again spoke:

"As for me, I am a Lutheran, I frankly confess, because I was born one. My deep love for the Church is bound up with my mother love. It is of such a nature that I cannot, without sadness, see any of my brethren, also born into this Church I love, leave it, though I know they are going into some other branch of the Church just as Christian, and at the end I shall as surely meet them in another world as if they had remained with us. But the fact is I want their company here. I am lonely without them for I care for them, if for no other reason than because they are my brethren.

[1] From Henry Eyster Jacobs in *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.* New York. Charles Scribner's Sons.

It is the same feeling that Anglic has when his brethren prefer the company of Romanus. And I cannot bear the taunt that we are only a modern man-made Church. And I cannot bear to think that any one should consider our clergy, even though unjustly, at all inferior in authenticity, because we believe that the power to commission them lies in the congregation of all Christ's believers, through their representatives, rather than in a hierarchy. For that reason I might agree to a proposition such as that suggested by Greatheart, though I may think it unnecessary. I cannot, however, agree to anything that will lose our identity in the identity of Anglic for there are many things in which I cannot agree with him. His Church is too much of a compromise, whose creators sacrificed every principle in order to keep in it men of all beliefs, and even of no beliefs. In its prayer-book the sacerdotalist and the anti-sacerdotalist may find equal comfort. Arianism and Calvinism are equally upheld in the articles of religion, and, generally speaking, anybody can find any doctrine he pleases in its formularies by reading into them his own interpretation."

To this statement Anglic protested:

"Admitting that all this is substantially true, the comprehensiveness of the Anglican Church and its vagueness as to doctrine have done more than anything else to make it a really national church, for the English people like a compromise. They have no patience with the severely logical persons who would sacrifice a good working *modus vivendi* in order to vindicate a syllogism. The English state is itself a most intricate mosaic of compromises. And that fact is largely responsible for its strength and power to-day. By reflecting this temperament of the Anglo-Saxon race, and by making itself roomy enough for the ritualist standing near the gates of Rome on the one side and for the rationalist not far from the cloudland of agnosticism on the other side, the Anglican Church has become an ethical and religious force, at once enduring and unique."[1]

[1] *New York Tribune.*

"But, dear Anglic," resumed Wouldbe, "your rules are too lenient. For one thing, you admit young people to full participation in Church ordinances at too early an age and without proper preparation."

"There, I admit, Brother Wouldbe, that you now far excel us."

"It is a danger, Brother Anglic. Carried to extreme it is but a step to the corrupt practice of Rome in our neighbouring countries to the south, where bishops of limited intelligence administer the rite of confirmation to infants immediately after baptism when the recipient cannot possibly have arrived at years of discretion, or even the tender age required by Roman order. This would show that the reliance is on the magic efficiency of the rite itself, which is not our doctrine, nor I think yours except that your great inclusiveness may shelter some of that mould."

Here Romanus begged to be heard for a moment:

"The mention of my name emboldens me to make the request to be again heard. I think that the date of our differences, those of Luthrem and myself, is now sufficiently distant to do away with much of the rancour which he has heretofore felt for me. We should now be able to discuss those differences temperately, and if he stands on firm ground he should not object to criticism. I do maintain that his is a man-made church, no more ancient than the day when he left us unadvisedly, and while founded on the Holy Scriptures, the absence of an authoritative head to interpret them renders it liable to error. By such means he may fall into the very errors of which he has ofttimes accused us, a literal interpretation of Scripture by words without context, and in his case from a garbled translation. In that way he might claim that the words, 'I am the vine' mean that Christ was a piece of wood, and that 'Thou art Peter' meant that the Apostle was converted into a stone. For the reason that individual interpretation led to grave error, our Church has not approved of an unguided use of the Bible. Then he inherits his doctrine of a true Presence

in the Eucharist from his Mother Church of Rome but is ashamed to avow it. His Consubstantiation is but another word for our Transubstantiation and I doubt if he who coined the word he uses could tell the difference."

"O Sire, permit me," the interrupter was Radic. "This assertion that Luthrem's people are no more ancient than the time when they, as a part and an important part of the Church of Rome, had a 'scrap' with the other part, is all rot. Where was this Protestant Church before Luther? It existed as a part of Rome. I might ask Romanus if he washed his face this morning, and if so where his face was before it was washed. And if I wanted to be disagreeable, I would add that the face might have been improved by the washing."

"Enough, Radic," commanded the Moderator, and the evident uneasiness of Peace was no longer noticeable.

"I agree with my brother Radic in that opinion," said Method. "At best, in my opinion, the matter is non-essential. It is astonishing what feuds have come from things not essential to salvation. If a man conscientiously believes that bread and wine are actually transformed into the body and blood of Christ, let him have his opinion. There is no use in getting into a passion and using offensive epithets. Or if he thinks, as I do, that the command 'Do this in remembrance of me' means that it is but a commemorating ordinance, surely if an error, the mistake is not of such a character as will ensure condemnation at the Judgment."

"I think," said Romanus, "that such a vital error as that is something dangerous to salvation. Luthrem is also in error in saying that in the congregation resides the power to confer ordination. I claim it was not so in apostolic times. The congregation may have been present, but the Apostles or those appointed by them were also present and officiating. Even if I admit that in our succeeding line, as has been charged, men of unspeakable lives administered holy ordinances, that does not vitiate their acts."

"There I challenge the conclusions of Romanus," said Luthrem. "We have protested against such doctrine, and the people are with us. In secular things the people are beginning to discredit a like doctrine that our courts of law can administer justice and sustain law if they are presided over by men who are themselves unjust, or who have taught men how to be lawless with impunity. The sanctity of the court inheres not in the office itself but in the sincerity with which its function is fulfilled and the justice which it secures. So also the sanctity of the Church inheres not in the Church, but in the purity with which the Church is maintained and the Christian character which it produces.[1] Our Church, in contending for the supremacy of Scripture against tradition, and for human liberty against corruption, stands for Divine principles."

"I contend," said Anglic, "that the great reformer went too far, as he himself saw. When Luther first denounced indulgences and afterward went on assailing, one after another, the corruptions and errors of the Roman Catholic Church, those who had come under the influence of the evangelical movement of an earlier time felt that now at last the day of deliverance had come, and rallied to his support. Luther's bold proclamation of justification by faith alone, of the universal priesthood of believers, of the sufficiency and authority of the Scriptures, and of the right of each individual Christian to interpret those Scriptures for himself, and his repudiation of 'whatever falls short of, is apart from, or goes beyond Christ,' must have produced a strong impression on those who had long been listening for such a mighty leader to voice their sentiments. And it was natural that when Luther began to draw back, in deference to the views of the civil rulers and from fear of disastrous revolution, the radical reformers that had taken him at his word should refuse to conform to his moderate scheme, and should set themselves in opposition to what they con-

[1] From Alva M. Kerr in *Homiletic Review*, July, 1910. New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company.

sidered a temporising policy.[1] In the most destructive period, the abuses of the Church were in fact so much in the minds of the leaders that they were blinded to the deep spiritual purpose of much that they were destroying. Nevertheless, the spectacle presented to the pious and thoughtful minds of the period before the Reformation was unspeakably shocking.[2] But when the flood which that great reformer had let loose began to be unmanageable and he was counselled by the secular powers to adopt a more conservative course from reasons of safety, his followers would not all approve."

"I crave your pardon," said a new voice.

"One moment, Friend," said the Moderator. "We wish to ask Luthrem but one question, that which we have asked the others, if he wishes for a unity such as we are here to assist."

"Sire, I would not disregard the evident wishes of kindly Peace. My opinion has been given. I do not care to enlarge on it."

Nothing further being offered by the witness, the Moderator turned sadly in the direction from which the new voice had come.

"Who is it that would speak?" he asked.

"My name is Bapto. I am interested in a statement made by Luthrem who approves not of a participation in his rite of confirmation before the recipient has come to years of discretion. In a fuller form that is also my belief, for I protest against even baptism under similar circumstances. We believe that is an ordinance whose efficiency depends upon a worthy reception, and that cannot be unless those upon whom it is conferred are sufficiently mature to appreciate it. For this I can give Scriptural reasons. On this and on other essentials we take our stand, judging all things by Scripture only. And we are not content with anything that cannot be specifically approved by that

[1] From A. H. Newman. [2] Charles Gore.

standard. Our opinions are worthy of a hearing, for we are a body of Christians of greater numerical importance than that of Anglic, or of Presbus, or of Luthrem, or, perhaps, of Method. I am urgent at this time from the fear that on account of the unsatisfactory results of this inquiry so far it may be abandoned before we are heard."

"You may proceed, Bapto."

NU

See, Here Is Water, What doth Hinder me to be Baptised?

"THE society of believers which we colloquially call our Church," began Bapto, "is composed exclusively of those who have come to years of discretion and have been able of themselves to take upon themselves the vows and responsibilities of this membership. Though we as a society can show no continuous line of connection with the Early Church, we go back for our authority directly to Christ and His Apostles, and for our guide as to what they appointed we recognise only the Holy Scriptures. Those not of us usually say that our distinguishing trait is an insistence on a particular form of what we call the ordinance, not the sacrament, of Baptism, for which indeed we find Scriptural authority as the only form in use in the Early Church, the form in universal use in the Christian Church for a thousand years, still the normal use in the Eastern Church, the usage of Rome in the age when her immense baptistries were built, and the usage of England up to the Reformation. All classes of Christians still regard it as at least one legitimate form. This form, while the only one allowable with us, should not have the too prominent place in our principles which is generally accorded it, for we do not consider that even the ordinance itself is necessary to salvation.

"Of greater importance is the belief that governs our practice, that the baptism of infants is un-Scriptural and

destructive of the true conception of a church as composed of regenerate persons. Baptism symbolising regeneration should not take place before the thing symbolised. Any other practice would infer that we believe in a magical regeneration due to the act itself. We have refused, and some of us do so still, to admit into our fellowship as partakers with us of the other ordinance of Christ, all those who have not availed themselves of the proper form in the ordinance of Baptism. On such grounds we have opposed the recognition of churches, such as those officially connected with a state have usually been, in which by Baptism there is a membership which includes the children of members, of such immature years that they could give no evidence of regeneration. And we have always stood for an entire absence of control by the state in spiritual affairs.

"Our belief stands on that most extreme form of the doctrine of the Reformation in relation to Scripture as the only guide to action, which claimed the right to private judgment in the interpretation thereof. In this we but desire to enjoy to the fullest extent the new-found Christian liberty with which the Reformation had made us free, casting off all remnant of superstition. Others, while freeing themselves from the fetters which bound them to Rome, were yet willing to retain as far as they possibly could with a safe conscience, much of the ancient doctrine and practice. We name no human founder. Our form of government is known as congregational, such as that used by those bearing that name, inasmuch as each company of believers gathered into one local fold, and having its own particular shepherd or shepherds, is a law unto itself, subject to the general rules of Christ, any particular form of doctrinal statement being largely a matter of tradition.

"With our refusal to admit infants to the ordinance of Baptism, we have conscientiously opposed the superstitious belief that all such who are not baptised are irrevocably lost. As already stated, we do not consider the ceremony as necessary to salvation, even for a believer. We think in

fact that the practice of infant Baptism as the entrance to Church membership was not the practice of the time of Christ and only grew as the superstitious belief spread that without it there was no salvation, even for unconscious infants.

"With these characteristic beliefs, what have we shown in results? A consistent Christian life in our members, a providential increase, great prosperity, and an irrepressible activity in good works. This has been shown in our missionary zeal. In that field we were among the first and we have much to show for what we have done."

"It is well," the remark came from Conservative, "that my brother, Bapto, has said that he believes Baptism is not necessary to salvation, for here is brother Greatheart, who, I am sure, has not been baptised officially, as Bapto sees it, and yet I suspect this Greatheart may eventually be found in Heaven. And I am sorry, but evidently there can be no fellowship between Bapto and Romanus, for Romanus believes the rite a holy sacrament in which there is inward grace. Nor will they agree on the form of Baptism, for though Romanus believes that the way of Bapto is one form, strange to say he believes also that in necessity even private Baptism by laymen is effective if only the words are correct, the water touch the skin of the one baptised, and if it be poured, as from a glass or spoon."

"Romanus is consistent but un-Scriptural," replied Bapto. "It is either his position or mine. He frankly admits the change in form of Christ's ordinance, but boldly claims that his Church has the right to make the substitution. As for Conservative, I venture to say that he no longer practises infant Baptism. I see he admits it. Why does he not practise it? Because he does not believe in an inward grace or a regeneration, and without that infant Baptism is unnecessary."

"Brother Bapto," this remark came from Radic, "also seems to think he has a corner on the Holy Communion. If the Baptists claim to be the Church, or a part of the

Church, they have no right to exclude a member of the Church from the Lord's Supper. A member of a church is a person who belongs to a society recognising Christ as its head, and surely Christ is as much the head of the Presbyterian, or Episcopalian, or Methodist, or Roman Catholic societies, as he is of that of the Baptists. The Baptists did n't institute the Supper. It was never intended specially for Baptists.

"And as for his form of Baptism, there is no conclusive evidence that any of the Apostles were ever immersed or that Christ Himself was immersed when John baptised Him.

"And as for his authority of Scripture, of course by private interpretation, that argument carried a little further must land him with his Seventh Day brother who says that we had no right to discontinue the observance of the Jewish Sabbath and to substitute the first day of the week."

"Permit me to share my twin brother's testimony," this from a new witness. "My name is Baptizo. I love my Church as the Church of my fathers,—I cannot be said to have been born in a church into which I can come only by my own act. I have often considered its advantages. It has no hierarchy, no system of ecclesiastical tyranny. Each separate body stands independently on its own foundation, each a little self-governing community, holding simply fraternal relations with other such bodies. These separate bodies have cohesive elements, visible, as in the Bible, Baptism, Communion, and invisible in an unwritten creed of much uniformity and power, without being fettered by the elaborate standards of a written creed. I am glad also that in this Church my worship is not bound by a fixed liturgy.

"However, though I may perhaps be untrue to my brother in saying so, I must admit that I have often regretted that our Church fellowship is limited by the quantity of water used in Baptism and the method of its application. Greatheart has been mentioned, with whom we both agree on things considered essential to salvation, but is it right

that he and I cannot be in the same Church because he has had but his forehead moistened, while not a single inch of my body remained dry? My way is all right, but must I say that he is all wrong? I am told that if we make our form optional we destroy the special significance of our witness for the truth. Perhaps so. I am sorry if it is so. But that Greatheart, though he be as my brother in the flesh, and though he acknowledge the same Master as I do, shall not with me partake of the same mystical bread or drink of the same memorial cup, because of his misfortune in being sprinkled, is more than I can agree to. That makes the table one of disunion, rather than communion. The Scriptures nowhere make Baptism a requisite for Communion.

"Now as to the private interpretation of Scripture as our only guide, we find that we cannot reach uniform conclusions without a uniform interpretation. We can each by our own interpretation support diametrically opposite positions. The Bible cannot be used as an infallible guide without infallible interpretation."

"That is my contention," said Romanus.

"And I admit that you have the true idea. And our interpretation is more narrow and mechanical than our theories require and does not serve the larger purpose of which the Bible is capable. The poetry of the Old Testament has been interpreted as sober fact. Flights of rhetoric and bold imagery have been measured with a foot-rule. Ascriptions of praise and warm effusions of worship have been recast into doctrine. Parable, metaphor, exuberant Orientalisms, allegories or figures of speech have been transmuted into dogma. There is a difference between treating the Bible as a living growth of the human mind and heart through several centuries, still capable of spiritual nutriment, and treating it as a collection of aerolites whose metallic value can only be ascertained through the blow-pipe and crucible. The microscopic way of looking at texts, disputations as to whether the preposition 'into,'

when used in close proximity to a pool of water, implies the doctrine of immersion, the chipping off of a text here and another there, to be put together in tessellated patterns of dogma, all impress me as a false and unnatural method of treating the Book."[1]

"We would ask the important question, of you first, Bapto," said the Moderator, "as you were heard before your brother Baptizo: Do you approve of this proposed unity of Christians?"

"We earnestly desire Christian union, and believe that it will come in due time, but we insist that efforts for union, to be permanently effective, must be along the line of a better understanding of the Word of God and more complete loyalty thereto, rather than along the line of compromise. We are ourselves anxious to be more perfectly instructed

[1] "Confessions of a Baptist," *The Forum.* New York.

Alva M. Kerr in *The Homiletic Review*, New York, Funk and Wagnalls Company, in "Church Lessons for the Bar," thus likens this erroneous method to a similar one which has crept into our courts of law and which needs reforming:

"The legislature passes a law, the courts so construe a word or phrase of the enactment as to defeat the intent of the law. The Church has frequently been forced to surrender the letter in order that it may have the spirit.

"The manner in which our wisest lawyers and most august judges quibble over trivial technicalities, losing sight of both the salient questions and the evidence, and seeing in law the end of government, displays the very attitude of such a ritualist as sees in worship the end of religion. The academic sticklers for the technicalities of the law were the class which Christ in His day most unreservedly denounced.

"The Church is gradually adopting a new method of Biblical interpretation. The literalist, with his word-definitions of which the author may never have dreamed, and the dogmatist, with his short proof-texts, garbled here and there without recognition of their original context and purpose, will soon be of the past. They are being displaced by the scholar who carefully studies the whole of passages and books in an earnest attempt to find out the real idea and intent of the author. Yet the courts, by playing upon definitions of a single word, still defeat the plain intent of a long enactment. It is by this "word-method," if it may be so called, that many of the most open violations of the law have secured immunity."

in the Word of God, and are ready to abandon any position that can be shown to be out of harmony with apostolic precept or example. That the scholars of all churches are so nearly in agreement regarding the leading features of the Apostolic Church, such as the nature of Church organisation, the character and functions of Church officers, and the number and character of Church ordinances, and that the opinions of scholarship are so nearly in accord with most of our traditional interpretations of Scripture, are highly gratifying to us and encourage us to believe that the development of Christian life and practice will be in the direction of greater uniformity, and that the Church of the future will more and more approximate our position."[1]

"You then insist that unity shall come to you and not that you should do aught for unity?"

"Nay, Sire. But I believe that if ever there is organic unity it will begin at the baptistry. All Protestant Christendom and both the Roman and Greek churches can agree upon Baptism, that is immersion, which is the meaning of the word as used by our Lord and His Apostles. The great Greek Church has ever been a strong witness for it. The Roman Church can joyfully accept it. Anglic provides for it. These, with all Protestants, can agree on this immersion, but on no substitute for it can they agree.

"On liturgy we may differ, though there is nothing to prevent us from adopting that. On polity we may forsake our unit system on slight provocation for good reasons, but if men really want organic Christian union, if they are in earnest when they express that desire, let them join hands with their brethren of all centuries and climes in this truly Catholic and apostolic form of the ordinance of Baptism. Then may there be organic union without doing violence to the convictions of any and in acknowledged harmony with the Word of God and its generally recognised interpretations. In no one thing is the scholarship of the world so

[1] A. H. Newman.

nearly a unit as on the practice of the Apostles and the Early Church in this particular."[1]

"On this point, Sire," the speaker was Anglic, "we may indeed all agree. But what becomes of what we have been told is the more important doctrine of Bapto, the Believer's Baptism, to which none may be admitted without credible evidence of having been regenerated by the Holy Spirit, no inherent grace being conceded in the act itself? On this we could not agree."

"And," said Radic, "what Bapto requires in immersion is excessively inconvenient; at times impossible. Compared with that, what Anglic requires, the mere laying on of hands of a bishop, is easy."

"We, Sire," replied Bapto, "receive our doctrine, Church government, and ordinances directly from the New Testament. To give up one distinctive article of our faith would be suicidal and disloyal to our Blessed Saviour. He either gave a revelation of His will to men, or He did not. If He did not, we are all groping in darkness. If He did, we are bound to receive and trust that revelation to guide us. If we say He failed to reveal Himself plainly enough to be understood by every one who will study His word, we charge Him with ignorance or inability to make Himself understood. We have God's word to sustain our method of Baptism, both as to its action and its substance. We are told that when Philip baptised the eunuch he replied to his question, 'If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest'; which shows as plainly as words can show it, that personal faith was absolutely necessary before the ordinance could be lawfully administered to any one. We should not be asked to ignore the teachings and example of Christ and follow the inventions of men."

"There I would explain," said Baptizo. "My brother's assertion involves the idea that every distinctive article of our faith, everything by which we are distinguished from

[1] From Robert S. MacArthur.

other Christians, is in his view an essential part of the foundation of our Church, and that to us the Church of Christ is but the fellowship of our type of Christians alone. I find in Scripture no warrant for such a claim and I am sure that many of my fellows think as I do. I do not think that we as a church should act the part of a papal inquisition and unchurch, unchristianise, and consign to purgatory all outside of our pale."

"To reply to your question more directly, Sire," resumed Bapto, "I would concede much for unity. I believe that if Protestant Christians in these United States would mass their forces and work as one man there is not a form of national or social iniquity which would not be swept away by their irresistible momentum."[1]

"That is to say," said Anglic, "unity to save our country but division for reaching the world. The horizon is too narrow."

"Narrow it may be," replied Bapto, "but wide enough for me and my country, or as wide as my faith will permit. Brother Anglic, we are not all wrong in our divisions. Take a handful of mercury, throw it on a table and see it fly apart, each globule a perfect sphere, but each reflecting a perfect image, as our sects reflect in miniature the image of the glorified Christ."[2]

"But, Brother," said Anglic, "of what use is it as mercury until it is again united, and it is hard to make the globules unite if they are at all soiled, from which we might infer another lesson."

"All of which goes to show," said Militant, "that the navy capitulates. Well, I always did prefer a sure land footing."

"I am half-brother to Bapto, not his twin like Baptizo," said a new speaker. "I agree with him in everything except his one hobby, water, of which he wants plenty for himself, but won't give any to the children. We are as

[1] A. J. Gordon. [2] *Ibid.*

alike as two peas. I calculate I can be heard next. I might help him out or explain a thing or two for him. Like him, I go my own way and lean on nobody, nor care I what any one else does. No one dictates to me what I shall do, or what I shall think, or what I shall believe. My name is Puritan and I belong to a religious society formerly called Independent, but already mentioned here under the name of Congregational,[1] as we claim that in the people themselves, as gathered in each assembly, resides the supreme authority for government. What I have to say may soon be said. But stay, I guess that my Independent friend, Pilgrim, can say it better."

"Let Pilgrim be called," said the Moderator, but somehow those few words conveyed an impression of weariness.

[1] It is related that Henry Ward Beecher once characterised the difference between Congregationalists and Baptists by saying that a Baptist was a wet Congregationalist, and a Congregationalist a dry Baptist. In polity and faith they are alike.

XI

As the Voice of Many Waters

"IF, Sire," began Pilgrim, "I must give a reason for the faith that is in me, it must date back to a time when Luthrem's great ancestor assisted by others fought the great fight for the truth. But all the reformers of that time did not think as the great leader did. He was conservative and felt the need of the aid of the civil authority in the conflict with Rome. Other reformers, once started on the path of the new-found liberty, would pursue it to the end. No half-way measures were acceptable. They would break with Rome in everything, in doctrine, in usage, and in government, both of Church and state. The early reformers were not organisers, but soon one arose in Switzerland, Calvin by name, who gave the impress of his strong personality to both doctrine and organisation. His opinions spread throughout the continent of Europe, notably in Germany and the Netherlands, where was formed a church on reformed principles, but distinctly antagonistic to the Lutheran, in that it would tolerate no state dependence, and it adopted a doctrine in reference to the sacrament of the altar as far as possible from the sacramental idea, denying not only the Romish Transubstantiation, but what they thought to be an equally erroneous one and a compromise, the Consubstantiation of Luther. These more radical reformers believed in but a memorial feast, and on that issue particularly waged relentless war not only on Rome but on Lutherans. The Church thus formed called itself by no man's name nor yet by a title of a distinctive

doctrine or form of government, but simply by the name Reformed, as if they still considered it the Church, the old one, but made over.

"The opinions of these reformers spread even to the land of my ancestors in England where the idea of independence from the state prevailed among a certain class.[1] Organisations were there formed to promote such independence, and their ideas came to include the independence of each company of believers, the one of the other, which on New Testament lines they believed to be the proper system. To them, wherever two or three were gathered together in the name of Christ there was He in the midst of them and there was the Church."

"But, Brother Pilgrim," said Anglic, "you must remember that the Church of Christ was established on earth nearly one hundred years before there was any New Testament. The Church was established on Pentecost, A.D. 33. There was not a line of the New Testament written until twenty years after that, and the whole book was not finished until sixty or seventy years later, and then nobody had the whole of it, but only a fragment. The Church was a Divine institution set up by God and propagated by God, and the New Testament was written in fragments, now and then, to instruct the Christian churches already established. The New Testament was never written to aid men to make their own churches after their own ideas. That was an error of the Reformation."

[1] The early Puritans had been merely dissatisfied members of the Church of England, asking for the removal of a few offensive ceremonies, for the withdrawal of prelatic pomp and jurisdiction from the bishops, for their association with the clergy in national and diocesan synods, and for the erection of a more efficient discipline for both clergy and laity. They wished neither to leave the Church, nor to abolish or alter radically its liturgy, nor to eradicate episcopacy. They were distinct from the small body of Separatists or Brownists, who in America were represented by the Pilgrim Fathers, and who rejected the very idea of a national Church.—Robert Ellis Thompson, in *The Historic Episcopate*, Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication.

"Well, Brother Anglic," continued Pilgrim, "we will pass that point. I was about to remark that these ideas of my ancestors also came to include a certain form of theology enunciated by the reformer Calvin."

"And I know it well, this Calvinism," said Baptizo. "My ancestors believed it. It is mediæval. It involved a belief ten times less Christ-like than the Romish doctrine that an infant dying unbaptised was necessarily damned. According to that belief, the consequence to us of the fall of our father Adam were foreseen in the councils of eternity, and provided for by the voluntary sacrifice of one member of the Trinity. But the benefits of this sacrifice, which might have been extended to all the race, were parsimoniously limited to an elect few, chosen without reference to character or achievement, but solely through the exercise of the absolute sovereignty of the Divine will. The rest were remanded to the everlasting misery which the sins of their first parents had entailed upon them, and which they had also invited by repeating ignorantly or wilfully the original transgression. The flagrant injustice of consigning to everlasting misery countless millions of the human race, steeped in the darkness of heathenism, unconscious of a Divine revelation, who have never even heard of the name of the world's Redeemer; the organised and perfunctory cruelty of insuring the production through coming centuries of swarming myriads of human beings endowed with exquisite capacities for pain, to be poured, in a voluminous cataract, as inextinguishable fuel for the ceaseless fires of hell; the utter arbitrariness of the punishment, the cold, hard implacability of the sovereign whose single eye exists for his own glory, and who saves the few and damns the innumerable many for the same object—all this constitutes but a feeble presentation of the moral enormities of the Calvinist's system. Complicated with this is a view of the sacrifice of Jesus that disfigures its moral import, converting its sublime and awful tragedy into a legal or commercial propitiation of the Divine wrath.

"Thus came the singular anomaly of a religious body taking its religion from Jesus Christ and its theology from John Calvin. The two will not mix. They stand in logical and practical contradiction. There is eternal warfare between them. Either Calvin will conquer Jesus, or Jesus will conquer Calvin. There can be no doubt as to the result. For a long time Calvin seems to have had the supremacy, but the Spirit of Jesus has slowly but surely made itself felt in the hearts and lives of good men and women, who have ignored the theology in their practical devotions to its religious truths. This revival of the Spirit of Jesus means the final extinction of a theology so entirely at war with the truth the Master taught.[1] Presbus once believed this doctrine, but I doubt if he does to-day. I doubt if any of the Reformed faith will now teach it unaltered. In fact, nobody could stand such a damnable system of theology."

"Theology be d——. Excuse me. I was about to say bother theology—all theology, not only this system which Baptizo justly calls damnable. His word misled me for a moment." It was the plain business man who spoke. "What do we know about theology anyhow? What 's the use of guessing and building up such systems from our own imaginations when we don't know anything about it? If God had wanted us to know, He would have told us. But what gets me is the impudence of the thing, for us to stand here in your presence, a being who knows all God's economy from the beginning and for all time to come, and say that our elaborately built-up systems of theology are God's plans. Some say one thing, others another. I state my belief and at once somebody tells me I lie."

"My Brother," said the Moderator, "is it different here from what it is always in the ever presence of God?"

"True, Moderator, I forgot. But it does not seem the same for we cannot see God. But in either case we are impudent, to say the least."

[1] "Confessions of a Baptist," *The Forum.*

"I see that I have touched on an unpleasant subject," said Pilgrim. "But to proceed. This idea of the independence of Church government from secular government, of which I was speaking, came to this country with my ancestors where they abode. They in the reaction made the Church the master of the state. Originally they had planned more particularly to be independent of our Mother Church in England. Here Puritan's ancestors also came, but they did not desire an independence of the Mother Church to which they still belonged, but only to obtain a strategic position from which they could purify that Church according to their own ideas of right. In the end, independence of that Church came to them also and then we both gradually grew together as one, organising on the plan of the congregational unit. For a time the ancestors of both of us refused even to federate with their own brethren in other local churches, for to them associationism led to consociationism; consociationism led to Presbyterianism; Presbyterianism led to Episcopacy; Episcopacy led to Roman Catholicism, and Roman Catholicism was an ultimate fact."[1]

"Then," said Romanus, "if they had followed out the line they would have had unity, and the present inquiry would have been useless."

Pilgrim passed this remark unnoticed.

"But this is not our practice to-day. We have come to at least a voluntary federation, though the ultimate governmental authority is the individual congregation in which each member has a voice. In that we are like many of our separated brethren, notably the Baptists and certain Lutherans.

"But we have stood for that representative American thing, Liberty, and in that particular we have done more for our country by the diffusion of our ideas than has any other body. As individual churches we may use our liberty to experiment in all things without ecclesiastical cen-

[1] Nathaniel Emmons.

sure, always, however, deferring to the warrant of Holy Scripture.

"We have no set form of public service. As non-liturgical churches, we are perhaps more of a preaching, or rather a teaching organisation, whereby we try to enrich the spiritual life in ourselves and apply it to others, rather than a system whereby worshippers meet together to give common expression to their reverence and love. Both functions are legitimate and important. For missionary work or great reforms the teaching form is more necessary. In that connection we have always stood for learning,—for liberal education both in pulpit and pew.

"On these lines we have built up a church system which, though we do not claim it to be the best, for no one can be said to be the best in everything, all having good points, it is yet one which has shown results in Christian life, good works, liberality and missionary zeal."

"Brother Pilgrim," said the Moderator, "what say you to the important question? Have you desired unity?"

"We have both desired it and worked for it, as our records show. We have now adopted not only federation among ourselves, but we have suggested a universal federation of Christians. At one time we had a working agreement with Presbyterians, but by that we were worsted. As we are bound by no fixed rules, and as our Church history has not covered such a length of time as to fix our habits unalterably, our ways, moreover, not being very distinctive, we are free to adopt anything which we can be shown is important in order to secure a greater compactness in Christian work. To the formal offers of Anglic we made formal answer, asking for consultation. We can accept his first three articles and, in what he has been pleased to say is a truly fraternal and Christian spirit, we have said that we might even find nothing objectionable in diocesan episcopacy, providing that the just liberty of local churches and local bishops be not disturbed.

"As to a liturgy, each is free to adopt what may be thought

best, as many of our congregation have done already. To my mind the liturgy of Anglic appeals strongly.[1]

"In our own proposals for universal unity, which are the broadest and the most hearty of any yet presented, we look to both a closer co-operation and, if feasible, organic union. Our basis all Protestants, at least, including Anglic, can agree on. We maintain a right to conscientious varieties of faith and order, recognising that such union can come only, not by the submission of any, but by the liberty of all, under Jesus Christ. I look forward with longing desire and increasing hope to such a unity of the Church of Christ,— to the time when sectarianism will be looked back

[1] This freedom enables a church to order its worship as seems most fitting to its members. The founders of the Congregational churches in the United States came out from the liturgical system of the Church of England into what they rightly deemed the liberty of unprescribed form and unfettered, or, as they said, "unstinted" prayer. They rejoiced in their freedom of access to God in public worship, in words of supplication, or thanksgiving suited to the actual experiences of the hour. Indeed, many of them doubted the rightfulness of the use of a rigid liturgy at all; and the Prayer Book seems to have been one of the rarest of volumes in early New England libraries. Congregationalism, as a whole, has always found the liberty of a non-liturgical worship congenial to its tastes and adapted to its spiritual profit. But no prescription prevents any church that finds beauty and appropriateness in appointed forms of supplication, or common confessions of faith, from employing these methods of worship if it sees fit. Nor does any rule ordain the exact form or proportion of the various elements entering into public worship. Each church is free to adapt its methods to its own necessities. There has been throughout the recent history of the denomination a constant tendency to increase the variety of the services of the house of God by a larger use of music, by responsive reading of portions of Holy Writ, by the employment of printed outlines and forms of worship; but these modifications have not deprived the sermon and the unwritten petition of the central place in Congregational worship which they have always occupied. There is also noticeable in many churches an increasing observance of the great memorial days of the Christian year,—Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter—days which the Fathers carefully left unmarked.—Williston Walker, in *History of the Congregational Churches in the United States*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

upon with shame as both a weakness and a dishonour. But if this unity is ever to be accomplished it cannot possibly be by the absorption of one sect into another sect, but by the free, frank, and mutual recognition in each present Church organisation of the liberties and the spiritual life of its sister organisations.

"The Congregational churches might well be willing to surrender something of their ecclesiastical freedom; they might well be willing to enter a federation with other churches or even an organic unity; but in such a federation there must be recognised the right of each Church to an independent existence, an inherent right which may possibly be surrendered, but not repudiated, seized, or trampled under foot."[1]

"We thank you, Pilgrim, for your testimony," said the Moderator. "At this time it is refreshing."

"Moderator," said Puritan quickly, "I would like to add a few words to what my brother Pilgrim has said, to whom I delegated most of my speaking because he was better able to do it. But I am not quite satisfied with his statements.

"I do not expect a true sectarian to recognise merit in any sect but his own, though a thorough-going sectarian is an anachronism in this age. As Pilgrim has said, there is good in all. Anglic has developed æsthetic worship; Presbus conservative force and doctrinal organisation; Method aggressive home missionary zeal, and one who has not been heard, who is known simply as Friend, simplicity and individual piety, as distinguished from the collective or churchly piety of Anglic with his historic continuity, liturgical order, and communal habit of prayer. This Friend has blessed Christendom with the truth that inward life is as important as outward ceremony, and that the individual can come to God without the intervention of a priest or prescribed ritual.

"We, Pilgrim and myself, stand for liberty in thought, worship, and Christian life. We may simplify our services,

[1] Lyman Abbott.

or enrich them, or adopt one method for one service and the other for another. But now I come to the point where we differ, and it is the point on which you are urgent. I think that if, for the sake of unity, we were to agree to anything which would do away with our characteristic ecclesiastical liberty we should lose our right to exist. I would then have no reason for being what I am except that I was born so."

"A reason which embodies safety," said Romanus.

Puritan continued undisturbed:

"This liberty we now possess because we have given up certain advantages of organic unity, to secure the advantages of local self-government; and we cannot add the advantages of organic unity, which some of us like Pilgrim covet, without foregoing the advantages of local self-government. We would even lose the advantage of being able to change, if change were shown to be desirable, in order to promote union. Anglic cannot alter his liturgy, or Presbus his creed, without long and hot discussions, heart-burnings, and formal conventional action. Our Church, tethered neither to liturgy, creed, or method, can indeed try all sorts of experiments, liturgical, practical, and even doctrinal, without producing that injury which experiments on a large scale are always apt to produce, even when they are finally partially successful.[1] I think that any of us who are aiming for unity on the lines proposed are not true to our principles."

"So, Puritan," said the Moderator, "you and your brother Pilgrim do not agree. This is sad to know. Your words imply that though you may not be an active opponent of the unity wished for by so many of your fellow Christians, you are at least lukewarm, and as such it is harder for you to please any. But who is this?"

In place of Puritan and Pilgrim a new witness appeared, a refined and dignified man, of scrupulously correct appearance, and giving the impression of being possessed of a

[1] From "Confessions of a Congregationalist," *The Forum.*

sufficiency of this world's goods. In general appearance he was not unlike Anglic.

On seeing him, Pilgrim again rose to say:

"This is he who was my brother, but I have disowned him."

"And why, Pilgrim? Your brother? And was he in fault?"

"In grievous fault, Sire. I am ashamed to say it, but he has denied our Lord and Master, and yours, our Saviour Jesus Christ. Our Divine Master, he says, was but a man as we are."

"'T is passing strange. How came this, Pilgrim?"

"By the worship of human intellect, by super-education, by zeal for doctrinal debate rather than practical piety. He cannot abide emotion, and would be disgraced to show it."

"Would he be heard here?"

"His actions would so imply."

"Would that be fitting, think you, in the presence of the particular representative of that Lord and Master whom he denies?"

"I have no hard feeling against him, Sire. He is my brother, though in error. It is not mine to judge or punish. We have outlived that error. In many ways he is lovable. He is for the uplift of humanity. He is gentle and unselfish, has a strong sense of duty and is morally correct."[1]

[1] Unitarianism has been mainly negative; it has been largely destructive; but yet the man must be wilfully blind who cannot see the service that Unitarians have done to religion in sweeping away the superfluous and pernicious rubbish with which Calvinistic puritanism had overlaid the essential truths of Christianity. Unhappily, they did not stop there. Too many of them parted with their Christianity altogether; and yet, throughout the whole Unitarian movement there have always been, as there still are, thousands of Unitarians whose Christian faith remained both simple and sincere. In the revolt from Calvinistic puritanism they have been carried away into an indiscriminate hatred of all ecclesiastical authority, which was perfectly natural, and so to a rejection of the ancient formulas of Christian faith, which was even more to be regretted; but thousands of them have lived and died with a tender

"Does he desire this unity?"

"I have not asked him, Sire, for we are apart. But if he does it will avail not, for in our faithfulness to our Christ we could not go with him."

"Who would next be heard?" asked the Moderator, and the would-be witness withdrew.

"There has been mentioned one, Reformed. Is he present?"

"He is not, Sire," replied Pilgrim.

"Know you if he would wish for this unity?"

"My impression is, Sire, that he believes too strongly in his characteristic faith to abate one jot of it for such a reason."

"Then this Friend of whom you spoke; is he present?"

"Probably not, for he is distinctly apart and agrees not with others of the Christian faith."

"Would he desire this unity?"

"My opinion is that he is a separatist from such cause as could not be abated. For one thing, he is apart from all Christians in that he believes not in ordinances, to say naught of sacraments: neither in Baptism nor the Supper of the Lord. He substitutes for a rule of life derived from a study of the Scriptures what he deems Divine personal revelations, which was a thing particularly obnoxious to my ancestors because they believed in a literalism of interpretation of the Word of God. For the hatred then engendered against those early Friends, who were fierce and aggressive, there was one excuse, that their exterior forms of

---

personal love for the Saviour, and with a depth of personal faith and trust in Him which might put to shame the cold-hearted worship of many whose dogmatic formulas are incomparably more correct. In fact, one cause of the Unitarian revolt was just this, that the then existing popular theology of New England—and of old England too for that matter—had lost the personal Christ in a maze of dogmatism concerning Him; and the best constructive service that Unitarianism has thus far done has been to magnify the personal Jesus as the Ideal Pattern Man, and so to exalt His half-forgotten human character to its just place in Christian contemplation.—*The Church Standard.*

demonstration, as practised in that day, would, if done in this, have brought them before the police court and into examination as to mental sanity.[1] They were not at all the mild, meek, inoffensive modern variety to which we are now accustomed."[2]

Without comment, the Moderator simply asked:

"Whom else then have we to hear?"

[1] Williston Walker.

[2] There was neither Baptism nor Sacramental Supper; those outward and visible signs were absent, but inward and spiritual grace was there, and the thing signified is greater than the sign. . . .

For the first time the sect [in Pennsylvania] was charged with the responsibility and conduct of government. Hitherto it had been publicly known by the fierce and defiant and often outrageous protests of its representatives against existing governments and dignities both in state and Church, such as exposed them to the natural and reasonable suspicion of being wild and mischievous anarchists. The opportunities and temptations that came to those in power would be a test of the quality of the sect more severe than trial by the cart-tail and the gibbet. The quakers bore the test nobly. . . .

The failure of Quakerism as a church discipline is conspicuous. There is a charm as of Apostolic simplicity and beauty in its unassuming hierarchy. . . . But it was never able to outgrow the defects incident to its origin in a protest and a schism. It never learned to commend itself to men as a church for all Christians, and never ceased to be, even in its own consciousness, a coterie of specialists. . . . Claiming no divine right to all men's allegiance, it felt no duty of opening the door to all men's access. It was free to exclude on arbitrary and even on frivolous grounds. As zeal decayed, the energies of the society were mainly shown in protesting and excluding and expelling. God's husbandry does not prosper when his servants are over-earnest in rooting up tares.—From Leonard Woolsey Bacon in, *A History of American Christianity*. New York. Charles Scribner's sons.

OMIKRON

And how shall they Preach unless they be Sent?

THE Moderator paused for some moments, but there was no response to his inquiry.

In the interval, when the proceedings were thus interrupted, there was no lapse into disorder as in most earthly assemblies. Instead there was unbroken silence, showing the most intense anxiety on the part of those present. All were afraid to speak lest the wished-for voice of some one who might help to pass this crisis might not be heard.

At length the Moderator called Representative, who as the first witness and the one who had placed the case in order was looked upon in some sense as a leader, and asked:

"Are there no others who would be heard? It might be said, and perhaps with some justice, that you have not yet made out a sufficiently important case to warrant this inquiry."

"Alas, Sire, our case appears to have broken down. There are many here who had intended to ask for a hearing, who long for unity. I see my earnest friend from Moravia, and my distinctly human friend called Universal; also a member of the New Church. I see also one who likes to be called simply a Disciple, and another who is known as Christian, both of whom I know to be greatly interested. Here also is one, Salvationist, who has been mentioned, whose work is unity itself, for he regards not any dividing lines whatever. And not only on that account is his opinion valuable. We would ask it, as that of a most valued friend whom we

cannot do without. He and Romanus, though the two are opponents, so work together in certain lines that they do more than all the rest of us combined to solve the social problems of our great cities. Then there is one here, apparently waiting to be heard, whom I truly know to be an Israelite and one in whom there is no guile, a man of great wisdom and common-sense. He may be interested in our problem, but if not, he can give us most useful advice. But all hesitate to speak further because we are all discouraged. We agree with you in the opinion that we have made but a poor showing and that it is useless to proceed further."

Representative having thus broken the spell by speaking, Objector was on his feet. Said he:

"You may recall, Sire, that in the beginning I took the then unpopular ground that these divisions, which we seek to do away with are not necessarily all for evil. I did not then think this inquiry of importance. I must confess that I have since felt a greater interest which has come from watching these proceedings, though much of my original opinion remains. Now I would concur with Encourager, but I have different reasons for my opinion. He sought to show that there are not so many discouragements, and so found encouragement. I would seek to find it by admitting that all the so-called evils do exist, but yet while continuing in my first opinions, take away the sting of disappointment by claiming that there is much good in all the present conditions. It would seem as if this offence of disunity must needs come, almost as if by Divine appointment.

"We have seen how certain earnest men set forth to reform the Church of Rome. The protest of northern Europe against the abuses and corruptions prevailing in that Church was articulated in the Augsburg Confession. Over against it were framed the decrees of the Council of Trent. Thus the lines were distinctly drawn and the warfare between contending principles was joined. Those who fondly dreamed of a permanently united and solid Pro-

testantism to withstand its powerful antagonist were destined to speedy and inevitable disappointment. There have been many to deplore that so soon after the protest of Augsburg was set forth, as embodying the common belief of Protestants, new parties should have arisen protesting against the protest. The ordinance of the Lord's Supper, instituted as a sacrament of universal Christian fellowship, became, as so often before and since, the centre of contention and the badge of mutual alienation. It was on this point that Zwingli and the Swiss parted from Luther and the Lutherans. On the same point, in the next generation of reformers, John Calvin, attempting to mediate between the two contending parties, became the founder of still a third party, strong not only in the lucid and logical doctrinal statements in which it delighted, but also in the possession of a definite scheme of republican Church government which became as distinctive of the Calvinistic or Reformed churches as their doctrine of the Supper. It was at a later epoch still that those insoluble questions which press most inexorably for consideration when theological thought and study are most serious and earnest—the questions that concern the divine sovereignty in its relation to human freedom and responsibility—arose in the Catholic Church and in the Reformed churches.[1]

"We in America have much to be thankful for, under Providence, for this disorganised Christendom abroad, divided and subdivided into parties and sects, which sent us Christian material. Without those conditions and the intolerance coming from them, which drove the various Christian peoples to our shores, there would have been no America as it now is. Also cruel wars and persecutions accomplished a result in the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ which the authors of them never intended. Two mighty nations had tried in vain to subject the New World to a single hierarchy. What they failed to do in building up a nation, divided Christendom did.

[1] Leonard Woolsey Bacon, *A History of American Christianity.*

"No widely extended organisation of Church discipline in exclusive occupation of any country has ever long avoided the intolerable mischiefs attendant on spiritual despotism. It was a shock to the hopes and the generous sentiments of those who had looked to see one undivided body of a reformed church erected over against the mediæval Church from the corruptions of which they had revolted, when they saw Protestantism go asunder into the several churches of the Lutheran and the Reformed confessions. My friends here, with many others, even now deplore it as a disastrous set-back to the progress of the Kingdom of Christ. But in the calmness of our long retrospect, it is easy for us to recognise that whatever jurisdiction should have been established over an undivided Protestant Church, would inevitably have proved itself, in no long time, just such a yoke as neither the men of that time nor their fathers had been able to bear."[1]

[1] Leonard Woolsey Bacon, *A History of American Christianity:*

And there is no doubt that this comminution of the Church is frankly accepted, for reasons assigned, not only as an inevitable drawback to the blessings of religious freedom, but as a good thing in itself. A weighty sentence of James Madison undoubtedly expresses the prevailing sentiment among Americans who contemplate the subject merely from the political side: "In a free government the security for civil rights must be the same as that for religious rights. It consists, in the one case, in the multiplicity of interests, and, in the other, in the multiplicity of sects. The degree of security in both cases will depend on the number of interests and sects." And no student of history can deny that there is much to justify the jealousy with which the lovers of civil liberty watch the climbing of any sect, no matter how purely spiritual its constitution, toward a position of command in popular influence. The influence of the leaders of such a sect may be nothing more than the legitimate and well-deserved influence of men of superior wisdom and virtue; but when reinforced by the weight of official religious character, and backed by a majority, or even a formidable minority, of voters organised in a religious communion, the feeling is sure to gain ground that such power is too great to be trusted to the hands even of the best of men. Whatever sectarian advantage such a body may achieve in the state by preponderance of number, will be more than offset by the public suspicion and the watchful jealousy of rival

At this point a new speaker was heard:

"It is all very well to comfort ourselves by considering the advantages of disunion, but that is not the practical question. I and my kind must simply have relief, for we are those most affected by the conditions as they are."

"And who may you be?" inquired the Moderator, who showed considerable interest.

"My name is Zelotes. I am he whose business it is to spread the good tidings which should be glad, the Gospel, to those who have not heard of it, and in other lands than our own."

"A missionary," said the plain business man. "Why did n't he say so? And a foreign missionary. Let him be heard."

"If it is the Moderator's pleasure," suggested Greatheart.

"It will surely be his pleasure, if it is Greatheart's wish," said Charity.

"Yes, good Charity. He shall be heard," said the Moderator.

"Thank you, Sire," said Zelotes. "My message is important. I will make it as brief as possible.

"In my opinion the time to champion diversity as a desirable thing has long passed, and I think that the time should be passing when it is thought desirable to make the careless statement that we have unity enough already, that we are virtually one in all things essential. Neither on the sea, nor on the land, nor in the sky, is there a wonder like the perversity which impels men to invent and go on inventing religions and sects, and then persecute others on account of them.[1] With us, this unity is a practical question and we are pondering and debating it more and more earnestly. We cannot give up the effort to attain it, or

---

sects; and the weakening of it by division, or the subordination of it by the overgrowth of a rival, is sure to be regarded with general complacency.

[1] Lew Wallace, *The Prince of India*. New York, Harper & Brothers.

rest content with things as they are. It is in our foreign mission fields that the longing for unity is deepest and strongest. There we see more clearly the necessity for a united witness. There we are driven to deal with essentials and to disregard matters of secondary importance. There we ourselves, among ourselves, are particularly united, for we are drawn together by a sense of a common cause and a common effort, as well as by the pressure of the surrounding heathenism. We cannot wish to perpetuate in these lands the divisions which we find so unfortunate in our own land at home. They are a hindrance, and we need every help. Militant will appreciate our condition when I say that our forces are so few, while the struggle is so fierce. But the promise of victory is so splendid. We are necessarily but the outposts of the Christian army which is moving forward to conquer the world for Christ, and it is inevitable that we must feel most keenly the difficulties and discouragements arising from a divided Christendom behind us. We are face to face with the entrenched religions and philosophies of ancient peoples. At the best we feel as if we were unsupported, because, by distance, we are cut off from the companionship and personal encouragement of our fellow Christians.

"Nor is the discouragement only personal. We realise how hard, nay how impossible it is to explain to such peoples the reasons for these divisions which have rent the Church. In so many instances they have ceased to be living issues, and we sometimes have difficulty in explaining them to ourselves.[1] In most cases the peoples whom we have reached and who are now members of particular branches of the Christian Church, are so merely because those who have reached them belong to such branches. They have no interest in the questions which have caused the divisions, and which have given titles to various sects. They have inherited none of the traditions and do not share

[1] *The Spirit of Missions.*

the temperament which brought those sects into being.[1] We do not face denominational instincts, yet we are sent out by authorities who compel us to teach as if we did. We are before a reasoning class of seekers after truth to whom we are compelled to give a just reason for the creed which we teach, the particular doctrines for which our particular branch of the Church may stand. It does seem to me that we waste time and energy in guarding that which is truly no longer a living issue, and with us time is scarce, and energy is valuable because it is in great demand as a necessity.[2] And to think how meaningless the whole thing is and the folly of it. If unity were back of us at home how simplified would be the problem. Then could we preach Christ and Christ crucified only. We may allow the statement that the Church may be divided, but should we admit that

[1] If we are to describe the state of things in China to-day it will be something like this: Christian missions from all the great countries of the world are working here, each on its own lines and each perpetuating its own ecclesiastical character. There is the great mass of the Roman Catholics separated from the Protestant churches by what appears to be an impassable gulf; the Greek Church, a small mission, but representative of a vast body of Christians in Europe and Western Asia, which is separated from Protestants and Roman Catholics alike; the Protestant missions sent out by the churches which arose at the time of the Reformation, or have sprung from those bodies since; and the Anglican communion, which is historically Catholic and at the same time reformed. All these bodies are separate and not in communion with one another.

From this state of division all sorts of evils have arisen, rivalry and competition, needless reduplication of churches and institutions, jealousy and misunderstanding, and as a gross result of all, a divided witness for Christ and a weakened influence for Christian life and morality in the face of the heathen world. One knows that these evils are tempered by the exercise of common sense and Christian feeling, but they exist nevertheless.—F. R. Graves, Bishop of Shanghai.

[2] Energy used in competition can not be used in progression. The tug-boat captain who put an ocean liner's whistle on his boat used so much steam in blowing the whistle that he stopped the boat.—Chas. Samuel Tator, in "The Mad Race for Souls," *Success Magazine*, February, 1911.

Christ is divided? If the difficulty were left to us to settle on the field, without interference, we would soon make an end of it, for there the necessities of the case preclude independent work even by the most bigoted denominationalist among us. Somehow in the presence of the enemy we forget to antagonise those fighting with us. Then each man's individual opinion does not count. It is simply how to win. Our calling begets brotherly love and precludes narrow-mindedness."

"It is a growing opinion in the home lands," said Anglic, "that in this matter of unity, missions must furnish, if not the solution, certainly one impulse to grapple with the problem, and the spirit of love and sacrifice in which it must be solved.[1] From a practical unity, evolved on mission fields, may come the reflex action which may bring the solution of the problem at home, in the way in which in England the civil service was reformed. That was in an unworkable and scandalous condition, rotten to the core. Then came a time when a strong civilian colonial service was needed, without which there could be no successful colonial government. That seemed impossible under a home government which included a corrupt officialism, the reform of which also seemed impossible. The Empire could not live without the

[1] If the Church of England is set, as we believe, in the middle place, holding tenaciously to the immemorial creeds and customs of the Catholic past, and yet claiming and appropriating the fresh light and new lessons that come with the progressive ripening of the human mind; if our position in God's time may prove to be a mediating one in the western world, then you may face your problems with an eager hope. Nay, more—and I say it advisedly—it probably rests with those in the great mission fields to take steps in advance toward the Christian unity of the future which seems wholly impracticable to our stereotyped divisions at home. The imperative requirements of native converts, the necessity of shaping truly native churches, the brotherliness of missionaries who are serving the same Master with the same spirit, under the same difficulties, the repeated suggestions of combined effort in regard to medicine and higher education—all these things force the pace and offer an opportunity to a Christian statesmanship.—Joseph Armitage Robinson, Dean of Westminster.

colonies, so great-hearted men on the colonial field undertook the reform there and made the service what it should be. It became an object lesson, and the desirability of the results was so manifest that there was imitation at home and soon a thorough reform there. The outpost showed the main army the way and in a twinkling the victory was won. The child taught the parent wisdom. From very shame he reformed."

"But I have not had all my say," urged Zelotes. "Permit me to give more details. I am urgent because our need is imperative."

"Would it not be well," asked Objector, "to know from Zelotes what church it is that claims him; otherwise we do not know how to weigh his testimony."

"Is that necessary, Sire?" asked Zelotes. "From what I have just stated you may infer that I do not wish to dwell upon the divisions of Christendom. I do not wish to be heard as a representative of any one class, only in the light in which we appear to those without, as Christians."

The Moderator ruled that the request was uncalled for.

"Then, Sire, I proceed at once to state our troubles. We have an immense task set us. It has been calculated that we still have from 1,000,000,000 to 1,200,000,000 human beings to reach in the non-Christian world. Our entire working force amounts to not more than 20,000 men and women. Of these some 5,500 are men particularly educated and set apart for the work; that is they are ordained men. A Scotchman will appreciate the statement when I say that that proportion would not give two such ministers to such a number of heathen as would be equivalent to the whole of his great city of Edinburgh, and if the whole of the greatest city of the civilised world, London, were heathen, the allotment would be but twenty-seven.[1] This proportion would require that each of us reach about

[1] From statement of Dr. Barton at the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, 1910.

166,666 souls as our share of the work. Some human lifetimes have been occupied with the conversion of one.

"For our work, we have been furnished with what has been considered a liberal support. In the year 1909 twenty-five million dollars were contributed for our work in foreign lands, which sum, large as it seems, is roughly about two cents or one penny for the conversion of each member of the non-Christian world.[1] I have heard some one here state the disproportionate amount it takes for each convert already made. The difficulties from want of men and means would both be greatly overcome if there were unity at home, among those who do not appreciate the drawbacks. If they did, their first step towards making their contributions effective would be to insist on home unity. By that we could at least double the effectiveness of the present working force and increase its numbers.

"With more members, we could better specialise, for we have to work in such various ways. To specify, in Africa, for instance, we have to face a condition which is best met by medical work on our part. In that way we can there best reach those we would by giving them something they have not. There the followers of a false prophet are doing effective and rapid work. The land is more rapidly becoming Mohammedan than Christian. In other pagan lands we must educate the darkened intellects, both adults and children, before we can reach them. Eight thousand more workers are needed in India where fifty millions are willing to be taught and are begging for a knowledge of Christ. In China we fight against indifference. In Japan the difficulty is to prove that veracity and chastity are virtues. There we have made a mistake. Because we are dealing with an intellectual people, we have dwelt on the doctrinal and controversial side of Christianity, but there it is Christ and not doctrine that appeals. In fact, modern civilisation itself is to-day the greatest hindrance to the Gospel. And

[1] *The Christian*, London.

we have need to care lest the worship of intellect lead to moral skepticism.

"Then there are the Jews to reach in many lands, and it is sad to say that by many nations the picture of Christianity which is presented to Jewish eyes is a very sad travesty of the truth.[1] In this category I might particularly mention one nation, the Russian."

"And why," asked Greatheart, "should you try to convert the Jews? They are a religious people, conscientious, and of unblamable lives. They are ruled by the precepts of the true God. Those of this country are mostly enlightened and themselves do missionary work in other lands. In liberality for the support of such work they put the Christians to shame. They believe not in Christ, but neither does Puritan's disowned brother. As well try to convert him. Were it not better to work with those who have never heard of Christ?"

"Brother Greatheart," resumed Zelotes, "in that suggestion you may be right. I cannot say. But Christ Himself set us the pattern in the Early Church. Since the first Jews were persuaded to believe in Him, a Jew like themselves, the work has gone on, more successfully at the beginning than now, because then we were more in earnest in the work and more united. But I do contend that a Jew is not a heathen and should not be treated as such. But as we have the opportunity, we can tell them who their Jesus was, though many of them in Christian graces are more Christ-like than are we.

"But there is one thing that I wish understood as my personal opinion. When speaking of unity I mean that I wish it to be of such a kind as will prevent the hindrances to our work which are due to the disunity now existing both at home and in the field. Some of my fellow-workers would be content with a unity of Protestants. But we have to face a far larger and graver question. Unless Church union can

[1] William Ewing.

embrace all Christians, Catholic and Protestant, the problem will be nearly as far from solution as ever. One sees sometimes an uncharitable map which professes to be a map of the world's religions, with black for the heathen, dark gray for the Catholics, and white for the Protestants. That is an image of which we have to rid our minds. We have to remember that Christianity is a greater thing than Protestantism and to widen our minds and hearts to entertain the conception of a unity which shall embrace all. We have to confess that the practical difficulties are at present insurmountable. But yet we must recall to our minds the fact that Church unity, with the majority of Christians left out, would be no solution of the problem. If the difficulties are insurmountable now, they may not be so forever. What we have to see to is that in our efforts at partial reunion we do not erect additional barriers against the larger unity for which we hope and pray.[1] But here is my own brother, Zealot, who works as I do among heathen, but at home. He wishes to speak."

"It shall be our pleasure to hear him," said the Moderator.

"I can say little more than has my brother, Zelotes. I feel as deeply as he does and would speak as feelingly as he, but everything which he has said applies equally to my work. Whether in the remoter and wilder portions of our country, or in our great cities close at hand, we have those to reach who are as truly heathen as any for whom my brother strives. I have the advantage in that those we seek speak our own tongue. We do not have to spend long years in preparing ourselves, or training helpers of the same race with those we work for. But with that great advantage our results are meagre. It may be we are not blessed on account of some hidden fault, but there are more palpable earthly reasons, such as Zelotes has given, which are a sufficient explanation. The work is great, the workers

[1] Bishop Graves.

are few, the support is insufficient. There sits one among us mentioned by Representative whom I envy, Salvationist. Him you might possibly call an ignorant man. He works by human wisdom, from a full heart, without the guidance of a creed, and without the aid of God's ordinances or sacraments, which is not as Christ commanded. But he is doing a work I should do, and I envy him his results. He has deeply impressed some of our noblest men. It is with a deep feeling of humility that we must confess the good which this uneducated soldier is doing, with his slender advantages, in comparison with what the Church ought to do with her inestimable heritage of spiritual, social, and material power. While we are discussing year after year how to reach the masses, he takes the short cut of just reaching them. He does reach them. He reaches the lowest and the least hopeful of them effectively. In hundreds of thousands of cases he holds them permanently. The good he does is incalculable. He is noisy, to be sure, but then he makes the masses listen. He is vulgar? Yes; his manners would shock delicate nerves, but there is nothing wrong or even coarse, in the vulgarity. It is only an application of an old rule, to become all things to all men, if by any means it may be possible to save some. His work is among rough people, and he adapts himself to them with wonderful tact, and with wonderful success."

"But," interrupted Objector, "his theology is defective."

"Very likely it is," replied Zealot, "it would be singular if it were not, and yet the little of it which he has put into print is both orthodox and evangelical, good and true as far as it goes. But suppose it were less so, who would have a right to forbid this poor soldier to cast out the devils of profanity, drunkenness, and lust, with the only theology that anybody has ever been at pains to give him? Would anybody have a right to forbid him unless he could undertake to cast out the devils himself? And is it not a rather hazardous sort of thing for anybody to forbid the casting out of devils in Christ's name by anybody else?"

"I agree with Zealot," said Anglic. "Objector should go among the people whom Salvationist reaches, and see the work, and he will find that it is real work and good work, which needs only to be perfected not destroyed. He will then realise that, with all our vast advantages, our Church barely, if at all, touches the classes into which this man enters and wins converts. What ought we to do? Pray for him? Of course. Give him our blessing? We dare not withhold it. But if we can pray for him and bless him, why should we not help him by giving him openly expressed countenance in a work which our own Church has not done, is not doing, and is not likely to do in this generation? Our Church in the past, in the stiffness of its original insularity, has had very little of that sort of wisdom, or there would be no Methodism and no Salvationist in the world to-day. Rather, perhaps, there would be both, and other things perhaps, and all of them would be within the pale of the Church and working loyally under her authority."[1]

"But I can see in my work in the further confines of my own country," continued Zealot, "more particularly perhaps than can my brother, Zelotes, who works afar, the great waste involved in the folly of disunity. Knowing from racking self-denial the shortness of funds compared with the need, I yet see duplicate buildings erected at my own door, wherever I may be doing my allotted work, any one of which out of perhaps three of four would be ample for all the work that could there be done, and in every case it could be made a great work. I go elsewhere and find a place where there is as yet no work done, and where what should be the unneeded surplus in my former field would go far toward a complete evangelisation. I am to-day, more especially through the trials that I and mine have gone through, from the lack of that with which we should have been supplied, a living witness of the folly of such huge

[1] *The Church Standard.*

blunders, all of which are without any compensating advantages whatever."[1]

There was again a pause, then the Moderator was heard to say:

"We have been sent among you, in the words of our Commission, to learn with certainty what are your desires, —if you are in earnest in your petitions, if you really desire that for which you ask, which might be known by your willingness to sacrifice aught for it, and your activity to bring it about. What do we find? You want something, you do not exactly know what, but you are not willing to aid in the slightest degree in the attainment of the object sought. Yet we think that you concede the demand of Zelotes that the thing must be had. Now what must be done."

Instantly in all parts of the vast assembly many rose and asked permission to speak, as if they deemed the final remark of the Moderator no mere statement, but something requiring reply. The Moderator continued:

"Do you ask for advice, or do you wish to give it?"

"God knows," said Greatheart, "we wish not only for advice, but guidance. But would it not help to hear what these suggest? You may thus discover their errors and rectify them."

[1] Edgar Blake of Chicago, Associate Corresponding Secretary of the Board of Sunday-Schools, Methodist Episcopal Church, made the following verified statement before the International Sunday-School Convention held in San Francisco in June, 1911:

The Evangelical churches of America are facing a serious situation. The six leading denominations showed a net increase of only 384,000 members in the year 1910. This represents the combined efforts of more than 160,000 churches, 17,000,000 church members, and an expenditure of more than $250,000,000. Each net gain of one represents the year's work of 44 church members and a cash outlay of more than $650.

PI

In the Multitude of Councillors

IT was the Moderator who then spoke:

"It shall be as you wish, Greatheart, but, in place of our former difficulty, when no one wished to be heard, we now face another as trying, inasmuch as an impossible number now wish to speak at once. Who shall first be heard? Who shall select?"

The confusion caused by the efforts of those who wished to speak, as well as of those who wished to prevent them, or who tried to secure a more orderly procedure, continued.

"I am powerless, Sire," said Greatheart. "To you we appeal for guidance."

Again Peace came to the rescue. Without direction from his superior and without apparent effort, by a look and a motion of the hand, he quieted the tumult and again there was order.

"We will leave it to Representative to decide," said Greatheart.

"Who then shall speak, Representative?" asked the Moderator. "Will you yourself lead? Have you a plan as to how this thing may be done? It is your opinion that this unity is desirable. The question then is, is it practicable? If it is practicable, how do you think it may be secured?"

"My suggestion, Sire, would be that we plan to do what we can and as we can, working from this land as a base for

the ultimate unity of Christendom, and from small to great things. Where we can heal a break in our own midst let us do so, until perhaps there will be but two or three centres about which the particles may have gathered, which may eventually themselves be absorbed the one in the other.

"A unity of Protestants in America would be better than no unity, even if the greater part of Christendom at large would be omitted for the present, for that would be the nucleus, and it would be a unity among some of the peoples who use the English tongue. That tongue as used in America is itself a type, being a unity made from every tongue under Heaven, as the American conglomerate race who use it is a resultant from all. It has been said that the English-speaking peoples, if they act together, could insure the peace of the world. A unity of English-speaking Christians can insure the unity of Christendom. A unity of Christendom must precede the conquest of the world for Christ. A good way to begin would be for the newer bodies to merge into those from which they came. Who will lead the way?"

"I for one," said Radic, "am willing to begin by being swallowed up by Anglic if he is willing. But what a mouthful! Within a year there would be no Anglic. As members of his Church we would outnumber him to such an extent as to have everything our own way. As his government is virtually democratic, we could outvote him in everything and control everything—conventions, enactment of laws, election of bishops,—until there would be only a Methodist body where before was an Anglican body, and I could see the change with equanimity."

"That does not seem a practical suggestion, Brother Radic," said Representative. "But, Sire, Brother Method has a grievance against Anglic which it might ease him to explain, as he claims that its removal would remove the greatest barrier to unity between those two at least. In accordance with my suggestion that we work in detail, this might be a starting-point, some one thing to be gained."

"We may hear it, Method," said the Moderator.

"My point is this," said Method. "Notwithstanding all I have said against Anglic, I must confess that I admire the Church of Anglic. I wish I could join it if I could do so without leaving my own. That I could do if both were one. I give Anglic credit for a sincere desire to make real a true yearning for Church unity, and do not, as has been charged, think that he is moved only by an ambition to enlarge the proportions of his own communion at the expense of others. This is shown by his proposals. But I think that he is usually too exclusive rather than too inclusive; keeping outsiders away by his fences. I am really an admirer of his services, of his devout life, of his effective system of administration, and the method of superintendence through the able men that he selects for that purpose. But this noble system needs no such uncertain and unfriendly props as his alleged 'Succession,' which treats every outside clergyman as a layman, under which it is forbidden to treat pastors of other churches as authorised ministers and which debars them from Anglic's pulpit."[1]

Anglic rose to reply, but Method in his earnestness would not permit it. Speaking directly to Anglic, Method continued:

"You know, my dear Anglic, that this stream of supposed transmission of holy power is as muddy as the Tiber.[2] No, Brother Anglic, you do not need to depend upon this unproved line of hands from the Apostles. The Church you love so well and so deservedly stands in its own beauty a peerless organisation that can afford to be generous. Let it invite other ministers to its pulpits. Ministerial reciprocity would give the cause you have so much at heart a splendid impulse. It can easily be done. See how easily. You have a law——"

"Let us have the law," said the Moderator.

"This law makes him as truly sectarian as any and is really un-Catholic. It says that parish officers shall not

[1] C. C. Salter. [2] Whately.

permit any one to officiate who has not been duly licensed or ordained to minister in that church. Nor shall her own ministers, without special permission, be allowed to officiate in the worship of others.

"Now no proposition for union which Anglic may make will command the assent of other bodies unless the clergy belonging to those other bodies are recognised as Divinely commissioned. Anglic's altars are not closely guarded against other communicants, but his pulpits are locked against other ministers. This is regretted by many of his own clergy. And the rule of prohibition is not a rule of faith, but of practice. It is the Church's law; not the law of Christ. Let Anglic repeal this law and others will at once be convinced that he is terribly in earnest in seeking the cure of schism, and a spirit of sacrifice will spring up among them also. Why cannot he make this sacrifice to the noble cause?"[1]

"I must reply," said Anglic, "that I state the immovable position of my Church when I say that we stand by the ancient customs and the ancient constitutional order of the Historic Episcopate; by the latter, because we hold it to have been established as the primitive and apostolic order. But it is well known that most of the Anglican reformers and a majority of the bishops and clergy since the Reformation, though they held to the episcopate for the reasons given, did not regard it as essential to the being of a church, but simply to its well-being. Opinion on that point was left free, and it remains free to this day. The Anglican churches have never undertaken to declare, either that non-episcopal churches are no churches, or that ministers not episcopally ordained are not ministers. Not one word on the subject has ever been uttered by any Anglican Church. The Church of England and her daughter churches judge for themselves and act from motives which they hold to be sound and good; but they pronounce no judgments upon

[1] From H. K. Carroll, in *The Independent.*

others who have judged and acted otherwise. No breath of condemnation is now uttered, or ever has been, against any other body of Christians, or against the validity of their ministry because of their lack of the Historic Episcopate.

"But I must call some of my friends who can, to speak for me and make answer to Method's proposal. They are all present because they are all deeply interested."

"Do so, Anglic," ordered the Moderator.

"Call Connecticut," said Anglic.

"Your opinion, Connecticut," demanded the Moderator.

"The repeal of this law," replied Connecticut, "which has been thus requested, would require six years for our own communion and would then still be in the formularies of our Mother Church of England where it has been for nearly four hundred years. For us to repeal or change it would stir up strife and division at home, and greater strife and division between us and our Mother Church. It would surely be an unhappy step to begin a movement for unity by disturbing and dividing our own household."

"Call Providence," said Anglic.

"Your opinion, Providence," demanded the Moderator.

"I do not think it would help unity. It is impracticable, as it would endanger our whole Church fabric. Our forms of worship also are so different from what those not of us are accustomed to."

"Call Minnesota," said Anglic.

"Your opinion, Minnesota."

"The mere interchange of pulpits would not promote unity, but rather hinder it. It would substitute courtesy for principle. Nor can we, for instance, invite men to teach our baptised children that baptism is a mockery. Can we ask to instruct us those whose belief, we think, is contrary to the faith once delivered to the saints?"

"Call Maine."

"Your opinion, Maine."

"Had we not believed that no one was duly commissioned who had not the Apostolic Commission, we would not have

incorporated that item in our proposals for unity. If our views are wrong, there is satisfaction in knowing that they are the views of four-fifths of the Christian world. The chief obstacle to reunion is not this law, but the widely prevalent notion that corporate union is not needful, or scarcely desirable, and that existing divisions do not necessarily involve the sin of schism. If this is not so, why then do not those who find our 'Succession' an impassable barrier unite among themselves?"

"Call Missouri."

"Your opinion, Missouri."

"Exchange of pulpits could go on, as it does now among other bodies, without promoting unity. The fact that four-fifths of Christendom require an episcopal commission renders it impossible for us to change our requirements."

"Call Albany."

"What is your opinion, Albany?"

"That Church usage is older than our law. To change the local law which confines it to our practice would not change the usage. The matter is in trust. We are not free to make individual sacrifice or contribution. On other points my brethren have spoken my opinion."

"Call Portland."

"Your opinion, Portland."

"This particular law is prudential, but the episcopate of the ages is essential. It is a great trust which we have received and must retain. Without it we lose our middle place between Protestantism and the two ancient churches of Rome and the East."

"Call Reading."

"Your opinion, Reading."

"I would not object if the repeal involved only the occasional admission into our pulpits of men who were not episcopally ordained. But I apprehend that such a liberty would not conciliate those who now stand aloof, so long as there remained an innermost privilege to which they could

not have access as freely as our own clergy, which would be the administration of the Sacraments."

"Call Trenton."

"Your opinion, Trenton."

"I do not think the repeal would have the desired effect. We must settle fundamental principles, lay the axe at the root of the tree, and not haggle at the branches."

"Call Springfield."

"Your opinion, Springfield."

"It involves the essentials which differentiate the one Catholic Church from the innumerable sects. It would cut us off from the mighty past and the as mighty present. It would bring us to the level of those who have no ancient history, and would leave Rome with her corruptions and frightful usurpations the sole historic Church of the West, by which means she could draw thousands to her obedience."

"Call Wisconsin."

"Your opinion, Wisconsin."

"To admit to the pulpit and not allow to celebrate at our altars would not be open and honourable treatment. We do acknowledge others as ministers of the Word, which is all they claim to be, but they will not acknowledge us as priests. Such they do not claim to be but we claim that is what we are."

"Call Ohio."

"Your opinion, Ohio."

"The burden of our inheritance was imposed too long ago to be objected to now. The religious people who have voluntarily and conscientiously separated themselves from the ancient and venerable Catholic Body ought not to feel aggravated if that Body insists upon the essentiality and need for apostolic ordination in order to secure full ministerial authorisation."

"Call Platte."

'Your opinion, Platte."

"From the evident disintegrating tendencies of these

Christian bodies which do not have the episcopate, it would seem to be essential to a vital and lasting unity. Reciprocity in pulpits might be regulated so as not to endanger the principle of the episcopate, but the regulation would be more objectionable than the present status."

"Call Alabama."

"Your opinion, Alabama."

"I believe that our mission is to preserve certain things which, when the day of reunion comes, will serve as the rallying points of a divided Christendom. One of these is this episcopate, which on the one hand the great Protestant churches have lost, and on the other the Roman Church has shorn of its ancient authority and prerogative. Recognition of non-episcopal orders would render our position absurd and would be a concession to the idea that the Church is a human society, not a Divine institution."

"Call Milwaukee."

"Your opinion, Milwaukee."

"It is a closed question."

"Is it necessary to call others?" asked Anglic.

"The ground seems covered," said the Moderator. "But in this matter what are the opinions of some of those of other faiths who have here testified?"

"Kindly ask them, Sire."

"Your opinion, Conservative," demanded the Moderator.

"I am coming to the opinion, though not altogether willingly, that there can be no unity without the episcopate."

"Thank you, Brother," said Anglic.

"Your opinion, Pilgrim."

"They say that at the door of the reunited temple we must be met with a demand for an episcopal ticket, as if Anglic were the Keeper of the House."

"Your opinion, Romanus."

"It is on the rock of Catholicity that the unity project has been wrecked. It is the simple truth and there can be no compromise."

"Your opinion, Presbus."

"Men who surround themselves with a wall so high that they themselves cannot cross it must be content to live alone."

"Your opinion, Bapto."

"We want no concessions from Anglic. We have six times as many members; the most successful missions of any, and more money invested in education."

"Why add to the weariness?" asked the Moderator.

"Sire," said Greatheart, "I suggest that the witnesses whom Anglic has called do not truly represent him, or even themselves, or their words are misunderstood."

"It is possible, Greatheart."

"And they are at the most but private opinions," urged Greatheart.

"But, Sire," said Anglic, "I have not yet been fully heard. While the repeal of this law was being objected to, we have made another, much to the regret of Earnest, by which other ministers than our own may teach publicly in our churches. It originated in the necessities of Zelotes and Zealot. But Earnest need not have worried. The law simply legalised and restricted what had been much done before, illegally. We had in fact, all along, more liberality than any one gave us credit for. Possibly it is on that account—that the new law is really more restrictive than otherwise—that our outside friends do not care for it."

The Moderator here interrupted:

"We would remind you that of the numerous suggestions which it was supposed so many were anxious to make, we have as yet heard but one, and on that you cannot agree."

"It is true," said Greatheart. "If it is your pleasure that we now proceed, you will recall that we left it to Representative to call whom he would."

"Perhaps," said Representative, "Anglic may have suggestions of his own. He has only been heard in opposition to the plan of Method."

"I would only say," said Anglic, "that I think there is no

plan which would be effective in the short period which is evidently the expectation of most of those here present. The wrong has been of long standing and it is not to be rectified in a day. Above all we must have patience. In the meantime we can be doing many things to help bring about this desired end.

"It is impossible for men, if they think at all, to think exactly in the same way. But, as I have already pointed out, there is such a thing as minimizing differences. Our differences, which have all been under one of three heads, of government, belief, or worship, have all in their time been useful though not fundamental. But many of them are now indeed dead issues. This we might recognise. They may have been volcanoes in their time and their fires may yet smoulder. At the most, they are not so great as they seem. Our distinctive titles perpetuate them. What do we want names for anyway? They are only misleading. We call a man a Universalist who holds that God is too good to damn a man, while we designate as a Unitarian one who holds that men are too good to be damned.

"Nor is it desirable to debate the points on which we have differed. Controversy will never close the breaks. Even if it would secure uniformity, that is not unity, but would be merely something external. A spirit of unity must come before unity can be realised. We can stop hating each other, particularly stop hating Romanus, and we can stop saying things which need not be said."

"Thank you, Brother Anglic," replied Romanus. "I will try to reciprocate so far as my duty to my superiors will permit."

"I follow brother Anglic," said Conservative, "in many things, but not always in his consideration for Romanus. It is sheer blindness, alike to natural facts and to the spirit and temper of the age, to imagine that we are likely to fulfil our mission to the age, to the country in which we live, by harking back to forms and phrases belonging to a com-

munion that is foreign in its allegiance, in its constitution, and in its character; is not in harmony with the American people and with the century in which we live. The eye that looks out for a restored unity in Christendom to-day must see the present, must look toward the future, must cling to a primitive and not a modern past, must oppose and not assimilate itself to the Papal assumption and the Roman claim. We have far more in common, in all our religious thought and faith, with the Protestant than with the Roman world. Surely the great evangelical verities of the Catholic creeds, which we hold in common with the Protestant communions, are a far closer bond with them than can be knit with the modern Roman additions to the ancient creeds."[1]

"Conservative has a right to his opinion," resumed Anglic. "But what a pity to leave out Rome, which might so easily be the means of union if it but saw the great opportunity which is within its reach. It is a great and wonderful part of the Christian Church with a wonderful power of recovery and expansion, and in moral and administrative matters it has a wonderful power of self-reform.[2] Protestantism has been largely a failure if we may judge by the disintegrating power of the churches. If God has abundantly poured His blessing upon Protestant churches, He has also been most certainly teaching them, and teaching mankind generally, by the slow evidence of experience, that there was something fundamentally wrong in the Reformation movement. The churches which owe their origin to the Reformation do, in their corporate character, bear more and more plainly the appearance of societies which have broken a fundamental law of Catholic fellowship.[3]

[1] Bishop Doane. Sermon at Consecration of Bishop of Rhode Island, 1902.

[2] Charles Gore.

[3] *Ibid.*

Romanism stands for unity without diversity; Protestantism stands for diversity without unity; Catholicism stands for unity with diversity.

"The divorce of Queen Katherine was an unholy deed, disgraceful to Cranmer and the English Reformation. But underlying it there was a principle of essential importance, namely; whether the English crown was to be subordinated to Papal authority and its interest sacrificed for Roman politics. On that question the papacy was wrong, and the English people were not in rebellion against the Catholic Church when they insisted that the supreme jurisdiction of the Church did not extend into the sphere of civil government.[1] The Anglican Church in God's providence preserved the whole of the ancient Catholic structure, both creed and Bible, sacraments and order, beyond the reach of legitimate objection; and it coupled this conservatism with a repudiation of the supreme authority of the pope and a whole-hearted acceptance of the principle of the doctrinal supremacy of Scripture.[2]

"But we might do as England, after all her trouble with Rome, is doing to-day. Forget it. We must educate the minds of both clergy and people. Education in itself breeds liberality. We begin at the wrong end when we first wish to make or unmake laws. Make the desire, the necessity, and the laws will adapt themselves to the desire. Propaganda of religious truth by judicial process has always failed and must fail."

Romanism stands for the Latin spirit, "You shall." Catholicism stands for the Anglo-Saxon spirit, "You should." Protestantism stands for the revolutionary spirit, "I protest."

The spirit of Romanism is an inflexible form for all races and temperaments; of Protestantism, every congregation and person a law unto themselves; of Catholicism, an authorised ritual, variable in detail as to different temperaments and conditions.

In Romanism it is the voice of one bishop alone, the Pope; in Protestantism, the conclusion reached by any individual mind; in Catholicism, the current belief of the whole Church as witnessed by her bishops in council.—*H. Page Dyer.*

[1] Charles A. Briggs, in *Church Unity*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

[2] Bishop Gore.

Radic here spoke, unsummoned:

"Though my own Church is good enough for me, if we must get together I don't see why we can't mix more. Let us know each other better. That remark on my part shows that even I feel some influence from those around me. We 've got to mix hereafter, I hope. Why not get used to it? After all, what difference will it make hereafter if a man has been a Lutheran or a Methodist or a Baptist? But it will make a big difference if he has been a good man or a bad man.

"I confess that I have sinned in exclusiveness as have others. Now in our meetings, when we get up to confess our sins, we often end by exhorting our brethren to forsake theirs also. Now here is something I 've got against Anglic. I might admit that his forms of worship are good, but he won't have anything to do with my prayer-meetings."

"But, Brother," said Anglic, "I know nothing about your prayer-meeting. I never took part in one and would feel as awkward in trying to conduct one as you would be if required to celebrate the Holy Communion in our accustomed way. Your way is for you, my way for me. How would you like it if I were to try to hold a ritualistic service in your Church? Nor do I know anything of your Week of Prayer. We divide our Church year into holy seasons, one of which is Lent, a season of prayer six weeks long. What do you know of that?"

"We are learning, Anglic," said Method, "we are learning, if not to be like others in all things, at least to appreciate the good. Why cannot we pick out the best in all? My brother Radic has many qualities we might copy besides his love for prayer-meetings. They give him his opportunity and so he likes them. There too is Presbus, dignified and scholarly, look at him. There are many things we might copy from him. But there is no use talking of unity if we refuse to exert ourselves. We must work, and think how best to work. As Anglic says, we may be able to do but little but we may clear the way. Unity is not likely to

come by a process of mutual surrender, but by an emphasis on vital truths. Truth may not be found in a compromise between two apparently opposite statements, but rather in such a deep unity as can hold the apparent opposites together. The true Body of Christ may be an organism more complete than can be fully represented by any one Christian organisation. When we come to frankly recognise the great good which God has accomplished through the instrumentality of organisations and methods different from our own, we have come upon better and more hopeful days."

"But I have not finished confessing—for others," said Radic. "Here is Anglic. What a glad hand he gives when any of our people go over to him. But let some of his people go over to Romanus—and Anglic apparently so friendly too—what a howl he makes. Says they were no good anyhow. Better without them. Wishes them well in their new vocation, but with a 'but.' Hopes they will be better satisfied and more true in their new connection than they were in the old, where they pretended to be what at heart they were not. If Anglic believes what he says he does, it should make no difference where his friends belong."

"*Mea culpa*, good Radic," said Anglic. "Have patience. We are learning. Some day we will see you going to Mass and I shall not draw attention to it, or feel dissatisfied that you have passed us by."

"But I know nothing of Mass, Anglic, and would not feel at home."

"But if you would go occasionally you would get used to it and would not feel so badly toward Romanus. For that reason it would not do any of us any harm."

"But I am not wanted," insisted Radic.

"That is for Romanus to say," said Anglic. But Romanus did not take advantage of the opportunity to reply.

"If others must speak for him," continued Anglic, "Romanus has made special arrangements to receive you.

He has a special delegation appointed to wait for you and welcome you."

"And one made up of Anglic's former associates," added Method.[1]

"But only to capture me, not to welcome me as a visitor," insisted Radic.

"One thing more," said Method, "if you will permit me to finish. Why not make results the proof? Success can come only by Divine blessing. This way is Scriptural enough to satisfy even Bapto. By their fruits ye shall know them. What difference does it make what a man believes so he shows results?"

"Wait a moment, Brother Method," interrupted Radic. "I had not finished either. I say begin at home. Don't preach of Amalekites or Hittites but Pittsburgites or Chicagoites.[2] Go for those who need it and whom we know about. They are live issues, not dead."

"Presbus has not yet given his opinion," said Representative.

"My plan," said Presbus, "would be to work together, have co-operation, as much as possible on all common ground and for all common objects. Put practices of secondary importance and mere theological opinions into a subordinate place and concentrate on essentials. Work for inclusiveness, not exclusiveness, and let each contribute the best he has; but do something and do it together. A common aim or a common peril will unite. A peril saved our country and may save our Church. We are like weather-

[1] Incomparably the most valuable acquisition which the American Catholic Church has received has been the company of devoted and gifted young men, deeply imbued with the principles and sentiments of the High-Church party in the Episcopal Church, who have felt constrained in conscience and in logic to take the step which seems so short, from the highest level in the Anglican Church into the Roman, and who, organised into the order of the Paulist Fathers, have exemplified in the Roman Church so many of the highest qualities of Protestant preaching. —*L. W. Bacon.*

[2] Bishop Dubs, United Evangelical Church.

cocks, all pointing in different directions. But let a wind spring up and we all point the same way. Politicians have to work together. Yes, work together. We can't do that without sometimes getting into our neighbour's field, and to do that we have to climb fences. We have got to do that if we want to work together. We may enlarge our outlook by studying our neighbour's field and taking a lesson from it. A noted schoolmaster[1] used to insist that boys who had never seen the sea were extra dense in everything. But let each refuse to interfere in what is not his own business. 'Render to Caesar' as it were in Church matters. Let each Church official refuse to act on what belongs to another. Let him refer it to the proper person. District the territory and see that each has his own field and a title to it. What 's the use, for instance, of all these young people's organisations all working in the same field? They were not organised out of friendship.[2]

"If we did not interfere with each other we would soon learn to assimilate. We might even learn to appropriate to advantage. Let other churches appropriate from the Lutheran Church its Scriptural doctrine on the sacraments and its historic usages, and then let the Lutherans and others accept the reverence and the order which mark the Anglican Church, the solidity, steadfastness, and culture of the Presbyterians, the fervour and the organising tact of the Methodists, the implicit obedience to Christ which underlies the devotional characteristic of the Baptists, and the aggressiveness of the Congregationalists. Then will come a sanctification by love which will bring a consensus of

[1] Dr. Arnold of Rugby.

[2] But in the rapid spread of the Society [The Young People's Society of Christian Endeavour] those who were on guard for the interests of the several sects recognised a danger in too free affiliations outside of sectarian lines, and soon there were instituted, in like forms of rule, "Epworth Leagues" for Methodists; "Westminster Leagues" for Presbyterians; "Luther Leagues" for Lutherans; "St. Andrew's Brotherhoods" for Episcopalians; the "Baptist Young People's Union," and yet others for yet other sects.—*L. W. Bacon.*

opinion, and whatever has the approval of all will remain.

"But my difficulty has always been to understand why these differences should exist. There is a right and a wrong. The right is truth, the wrong error. We should not hold error, but should find the truth. What is truth?"

"That is an old query, Brother Presbus. Would we could answer it," said Greatheart.

"Romanus has been repeatedly mentioned," suggested Representative. "He should speak for himself."

"Your opinion, Romanus," demanded the Moderator.

"It is not for me to speak officially except by permission of my lawful superiors. Were I to speak for myself, I should draw attention to the toleration manifested by one of our own Church when he successfully founded one of our American colonies. It is not always what is best, but what is most practicable that is most desirable.[1] But I think that Protestantism is disintegrating and disintegration means death. Congregations disappear, preachers receive

[1] The following refers to an act of toleration passed in 1649 by the Maryland Colonial Assembly, composed of the supporters of Lord Baltimore, who included both Roman Catholics, like the head of the Colony, and Protestants, the former being in the majority:

It was the only sensible position to take in a province inhabited by men of different religious creeds. The evils of the enforcement of any one creed under such circumstances were greater than the evil of tolerating what was false, and like a practical Englishman Lord Baltimore chose the lesser evil. He had to decide as the responsible head of a mixed community, not on what was best in theory but on what was practicable,—what was in practice most conducive to the welfare of the community. He was the first to establish by law a *modus vivendi* between conflicting worships, which has since obtained in all civilised countries where Christendom is divided. Whatever we may think should have been the proper means of preventing the origin and early propagation of novelties in religion, it seems certain that once they have gained a solid and seemingly permanent foothold, the civil enforcement of any one favoured creed as against all others, can be no longer the efficacious means of healing the division.—Thomas O'Gorman, in *History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

no calls, pulpits are vacant, towns once actively religious have become the homes of unbelievers. Then Protestants cry for reunion as a remedy. The word is theirs not ours. Reunion would possibly mean that at some past time the Christian body divided itself into parts, each one with equal or nearly equal claims in the final adjustment. Now such 'reunion' is at once open to criticism, for the Church of God, as we understand it, is to-day a united, living, visible body. Its existence is not segmentary; it is not a thing of numbers, separated, mutilated, and imperfectly existent. The Church of God may have been sorely wounded, yet never was her life threatened through dismemberment. She stands to-day, as she did in the past, One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church."[1]

"I am glad to hear from Romanus." The speaker was Baptizo. "He should be heard. I believe in fair play to all. We should cultivate him and draw out his good qualities. To do so we should cease calling him hard names like Antichrist, the man of sin, the great harlot. Then we may not be called heretics in return. We should cease to remind his Church of the atrocities of her past history, of the inquisition and the fires of persecution, as things she would perpetuate again if she had the power. Not that the atrocities should be forgotten, or the crimes and woes of the guilty past should cease to be lights and beacons for the future. But it does not follow, because the Catholic Church was once a persecutor, she is or wishes to be one now—I mean the great body of her members, not some of the ambitious and power-loving ecclesiastics who forget that they live in the twentieth century, not the tenth. I know it is said that Rome never changes, but this is a mistake; she does change, and she cannot help changing, like all the world besides. No man can now be a bigot of the fifteenth century, if he would. The barbarities then practised were the products of a barbarous age, when the doctrines of

[1] Archbishop Glennon.

religious liberty had not dawned upon the world, when religion, of whatever kind—Christian, Mohammedan, or Pagan—was an institution of the State, and dissent was treason. In those days every sect on earth was a persecutor, and, from their standpoint, logically so.

"We should respect the civil and religious rights of the Roman Catholics as well as our own. We should no more compel their children to read King James's Version of the Bible in our public schools than submit to a like dictation as to the Douay or a Baptist version. We should not insist that, by constitution or law, this country is Protestant rather than Roman Catholic. It is exclusively neither; it is inclusively both,—tolerating and protecting all alike. If Roman Catholics, as such, conspire to abolish our public schools, or to get possession for their own purposes of the public offices, or to procure sectarian endowments from the public funds, let them be opposed in all this, just as they would be if they were Mormons, or Jews, or Congregationalists; opposed not because of their religion, but because of their mischievous and unlawful acts.

"Let there begin to be such advances as are possible toward a mutual recognition between Protestants and Catholics as fellow Christians, and co-operation in measures for the promotion of common objects of public good. Such advances are probably not yet practicable to any great extent. Protestants and Roman Catholics are still for the most part Ishmaelites toward each other.[1] We see in every priest a Jesuit in disguise, or a libertine using the confessional for the seduction of women. We peer into the cellars of churches and nunneries to spy out the dungeons we suspect are built there; and are sure that there is a vast conspiracy at Rome to overthrow our government, headed by the poor old man that can hardly keep his own. So, alas, little can be hoped for at present in the way of union there. Still, let us not despair. We have not supposed

[1] Henry Ward Beecher used to say that there are some people who think they are good Christians mainly because they hate the Catholics.

that anything could be done; we have shrunk almost with horror from the thought of giving the hand of fellowship to a 'bloody papist.' The very conception that the thing is possible will begin to make it possible. The way will open for us to invite Roman Catholic participation in efforts against intemperance, and other measures of philanthropy and reform. And who can tell what may ultimately come, when both communions shall have learned to know each other better?

"If we would root out Romanism from our land and from the world, let us do it by holding up by the side of it a form of Christianity which is purer, nobler, and more like Christ our Master. In no way can the power of Protestantism be made so apparent or effective as this. Here the two churches are side by side, here they are going to remain. If we have a better religion than our neighbours, one that more richly blesses our souls and makes us more loving and fruitful in all good things, they will see and feel it, and, seeing, they will want it for themselves and their children. No priest can shut out such an influence from his flock, nor always, indeed, from his own heart."[1]

"My brother Baptizo stirs me to good thoughts," commented Bapto. "But to come down to practical things, I would like to add that to me the bread-and-butter argument against unity is the hardest to get over. Here are thousands of clergymen and others whose offices, honours, and emoluments depend on keeping up these divisions. It will be necessary to be hard-hearted to remedy the trouble.

"Then, too, we now work in a wrong way in another direction. Besides helping division by planting and aiding churches where none are needed, we assist churches hardly able to keep alive, with money which if put into a church with better chances would make it worth while. According to Scripture we should give to him that hath. We should do away with the weakest and give to the strongest. We

[1] J. P. Warren, in *Watchman and Reflector.*

would thus follow not oppose nature in the survival of the fittest. Only selfishness can object and that is one of our troubles. We should be as one for Christ and not as many for ourselves. Then there would be more real Christians and fewer infidels. We may have no fixed plans for unity as yet, but they will follow when we have a more fixed desire. Then we can find a way. When two people fall deeply in love they usually find a way to get married.

"It has been said here that the tendency in the Reformation was to go too far. Now some are saying that there is danger in going too far in our zeal for reunion, in a greater willingness to give up. Don't be afraid. Down our way a man to be sociable when he calls may take off his coat. It don't follow that he is going to take off his shirt also. Some say we are reaching after an impracticable ideal. What 's the odds? They said that when we wanted to abolish slavery. The steam railway was called an impracticable ideal when the best speed was slower than a mule on a tow-path."

"We might hear from Pilgrim," suggested Representative.

"Your opinion, Pilgrim," said the Moderator.

"My opinion, Sire, is not unlike many of those which have already been expressed. I think, however, that some of us are so much wrapped up in ourselves, in our own Church, as to ignore the existence of other churches altogether. Others of us prefer to proselyte rather than convert. To such the satisfaction is greater to welcome into their churches children who had belonged elsewhere than to baptise that many heathen. Nor will we arrive at unity by suppressing our peculiarities. Nor can permanent union come by the exercise of arbitrary power.[1]

[1] The attempt to accomplish this by the domination of even the most splendid system of sheer authority over conscience and intelligence and history, or the attempt to accomplish it by the denunciation of points of difference rather than by the detection of points of agreement, has been, and must always be, a lamentable failure.—*Bishop Doane.*

"Let us look for the good rather than the bad, and we will find much of it everywhere. But the day is past and gone, it seems to me, when men cannot be sure that they are asserting truth unless they do it in the way of denying and denouncing error, or when the only satisfactory assurance of what one possesses himself is found in declaring and delighting in the thought that some one else does not possess it."[1]

"Perhaps Militant may have an opinion," suggested Representative.

"Your opinion, Militant," commanded the Moderator.

"The barriers," replied Militant, "will not be carried by a general assault either from without or from within, but by a siege. With the proper manœuvres they will in time crumble away."

"And I have not been asked," said Objector.

"There was no need, Brother," replied Representative. "We knew you would surely speak. But I have no doubt all are ready to hear you."

"Well, I think the way to have unity is to unite. The Moderator has hinted that it is all within our own control. You have heard of the boy who thought he could have made the world. 'How would you have done it, my son,' he was asked. 'Why just get a wheelbarrow and a shovel and some dirt and just make it.'"

"But how, Brother?" asked Representative.

"Ah, there you have me," replied Objector. "That is the true question."

"And that is where we need help from this Commission,

[1] When unity is won it will be, not by pride in Apostolic Succession, but by the humbleness of the Apostolic spirit; not by insistence upon catholicity as meaning merely, what it does in part, an unbroken hold upon the authority of the past, but meaning still more the universalness of full sympathy with the age in which we live, and a larger outlook upon the wide future of the wide world; not by the denial of grace in sacraments ministered by men not episcopally ordained, but by manifestation of the holiness which the grace of these sacraments breeds in ourselves.—*Bishop Doane.*

Sire," said Representative. "But we have not yet heard from one of our practical men, Magnate."

"Your opinion, Magnate," commanded the Moderator.

"My opinion," said Magnate, on rising, "has already been given. I would organise a religious trust for the unification of Christendom, not, as it has been called, the reunion of Christendom, for to my mind at no time since the Church has grown to be a Church worthy of the name, has its condition been such as to make a return to it desirable. But you still ask, how? Yes, that is the question Well, make a beginning. If we can't take in all, take in what we can. If we can't take in the world, begin with America. If in this country the gulf between Protestantism and Romanism is still too great, make it at first only Protestantism. If Protestantism can't unite with Anglicanism, leave Anglicanism out for the present. Make a beginning. Again you ask 'how' even for that much. What we once did in this country we can do again. We were once a number of separate colonies. We had a republic in Massachusetts, a democracy in Rhode Island, a monarchy in New York, and an aristocracy in New Jersey. These colonies would never have become the United States had the patriots of that day reasoned with respect to civil nationality after the fashion in which we now reason about ecclesiastical nationality.[1] If such men as Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, Richard Henry Lee, John Adams, James Monroe, John Hancock, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and others, out of such dissimilar materials could form a lasting union, one now composed of about fifty separated but united states with ninety millions of inhabitants, all living harmoniously under one general constitution, giving a three-fold form of government, legislative, judicial, and executive, and that constitution formed by fallible men, would it not seem possible that the adherents and members of Christ's kingdom could form a unity?

[1] *A National Church*, W. R. Huntington.

"I see no reason why we cannot work for such a glorious national church, a church which when fully formed might be called the United Church of the United States.[1]

"And what this Church is to be need not be settled, as we have been trying to settle it, by ascertaining who first sighted our land, or by proving that the first baby christened within the colonies was baptised into this faith or that.

"Such a national church could take a leading part in the world's affairs and the world's life until there were a concentration of effort and a grouping of appliances and funds throughout the world. This can be done by the Church conforming itself to the American spirit,—the spirit of progression. We can't expect all men to agree to a single set of dogmas and opinions, but all the Christian churches can, without prejudice to their creeds or ideas, unite in an American religion, a religion that conforms to the principles and spirit of the American Republic and the American people. It must be democratic and hospitable, so broad as to open the doors for the admission of all believers in God, regardless of their attitude toward obscure theological distinctions and non-essential dogmas. When that time comes there will be a union of forces, and the Church will say, come in atheist, doubter, believer, Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, Buddhist, labourer, employer, ignorant, or cultured, of whatever estate or belief.[2] Is it not a glorious conception and worth trying for?"

"Yes," said Militant, "and to get it we want to get together as a national army and we want to get near each other. Where the picket guards of two fighting parties get within speaking distance, they sometimes find they are not enemies after all. At least they find they are not such bad fellows as they are said to be."

"Yes," said Greatheart, "I agree that it should be such a church as will promote itself by having qualities that will make all desire fellowship. The object is difficult to attain

[1] Charles W. Shields. [2] Charles F. Patterson.

because it is the harmonising of a great variety of discordant elements, and they scattered over a vast area. But there was the same difficulty when we harmonised the thirteen states under one form of government and the same causes made the difficulty. Then they were harmonised by agreement among the leaders of the movement. It could have been done in no other way. That is the way to do it now. But I object to the proposed name. It should be called simply 'Our Father's House'."

"For me, I 'm 'agin' it," said Radic, "for that means a government church and corruption. If we become very religious outwardly under regulating laws, we may come to do even as the Mohammedans and have the call to prayer attended to by government officials."

"At least that would be a practical detail," said Greatheart.

"I should say," said Militant, "that in this proposed organisation we should at least follow the lines of our territorial divisions, not only the country but the state and the county, the last being the unit, not clusters of people. As a national church we must recognise territory. The requisites of all national churches have always been polity or law, sovereignty or rule, and territory. Without these we cannot have a national church."

"Already," said Zelotes, "as a matter of fact we are now really creating national churches in mission fields while we have none at home."

"Then let the mission churches show us the better way, as has already been suggested," said Militant.

"It seems to me," said Objector, "that the idea of Church union on such a basis would require a pope, a visible head, and who would be the pope? I am this far ready only for a mutual recognition of the various Christian bodies. That will be a great step in advance. Our nationality began in that way. The different colonies that were independent of each other, recognised each other's rights for a mutual object, and the result was a consummation of union.

"If we are not going to have a pope, it seems to me we are going to have trouble. What is this national church to be? Is it to be a conglomerate of everything, or is it to be an excised Church, with everything distinctive omitted? If neither, which one church, now existent, are we to follow? Which one is already nearest to the ideal? If we include Rome, are we to follow that Church? Good reasons for so doing may be that it represents one of the most predominating beliefs of the country, and already approaches a strong national form of government. We say no because we fear the power of Rome. But the question, Shall Rome rule us? was settled when this very union of states was formed, which has been held up to us as a model for this proposed church. Then the Church was absolutely divorced from all secular power and made a kingdom not of this world. We in America might as well now fear Roman ascendency as the power of the dead Cæsar himself who made it. That Church is out of date. The time has passed when a churchly mother can hush inquiry, as any mother hushes her child, with a 'never mind why.'[1] The child has grown beyond that method. But thank God it is no longer necessary to prove loyalty to Reformation principles by vilifying the pope.

"If we cannot adopt as our model a centralised church like the Roman; if we are not to remain forever a nation of warring, jarring sects, having no visible unity, nor visible catholicity, can we select any one of the multiplicity of fragments to gradually absorb the rest and eventually become the prevailing religion? If so, what one?

"Is the Methodist Church, for instance, to be the type of this national church? It has many elements of popularity and success. Its system of faith is not sufficiently definite and fixed and it has no higher authority for its ministry to rest on than Mr. John Wesley.

"Is it to be the Baptist sect? There is no one such sect

[1] W. R. Huntington.

but many, marked in nothing but the principle of immersion, and separated from each other upon a multitude of disputed subjects. Moreover, it has so little resemblance to Heaven as to exclude the infant child.

"Is it the Congregationalist, the sober original kind? That kind has not held its own in that portion of our land where it first started.

"Are we all to become Presbyterians? If is meant the kind that existed two hundred years ago and is defined in the Westminster catechism, that does not exist to-day.

"We need an American Catholic Church; Protestant as it relates to Romanism, not Protestant as that term is understood in continental Europe where it is identified with infidelity, but Protestant as opposed only to what is Roman; Episcopal as it relates to her primitive form of Church government; Catholic as it relates to her Divine and unchangeable system of faith and practice; and American as it relates to her entire independence, not only of foreign influence and foreign power, but of that injurious union of Church and State, which, from the time of Constantine, has fettered and degraded the Roman Church and from which, in this country, she now rejoices to be free. In all her departments of legislation, vestries or boards, diocesan conventions or synods, or national councils, she should be so thoroughly republican that no law or canon can be enacted which is not sanctioned by the united voice of her clergy and her laity. But there is no reason why she should not have the energy, courage, and moral heroism of the old Puritan Congregationalists, and so far and no farther she may have the Puritan element. There is no reason why she should not have the same love of freedom which originally distinguished the Baptists and brought them into being, and so far and no farther she may have the Baptist element. There is no reason why she should not have the warmth and fire of Methodism, as when Wesley woke the slumbers of the dead, and so far and no farther she may have the Methodist element. There is no reason why her mem-

bers should not emulate the zeal of the Roman Catholics in their devotion to her interests, nor why they should not celebrate her worship, as the One, Only, Catholic and Apostolic Church, with primitive apostolic grandeur and magnificence, yet without superstition and intolerance, and so far and no farther she may have the Roman Catholic element. And then she must have the same conservative principle for which Mason and Miller contended in the days of Presbyterian glory, and so far and no farther she may have the Presbyterian element.

"At the same time she is, and must forever be, free of all the defects of her component parts; for, having an unchangeable system of doctrine, discipline, worship, ministry, and sacraments, never, like the Roman Catholics, can she destroy the faith by additions and corruptions, and never, like the sects, can she deface and mutilate the truth by subtractions and excisions. Such, then, is the Church which God in His providence will establish in this land, not a narrow, bigoted, and exclusive sect, not an ephemeral body, originating in the whims and oddities of some individual mind and destined to an ephemeral existence, not the representative, in this twentieth century, of mediæval Christianity, or of any other kind of Christianity which is merely Roman, Puritan, or sectarian, but the American Catholic Church,—the future Church of this great nation, destined to exert its ameliorating power not upon this nation only, but through this nation upon all the nations of the old world."[1]

Bapto here asked to be heard, and his request was granted. Said he:

"I agree that this coming national Church should not be made by absorption or compromise. To be successful it must have a common supreme standard of authority,—the Bible. In agreeing to this no intelligent Christian makes any compromise. It must have a creed, such as, 'if thou

[1] James A. Boles.

shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and believe with thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead thou shalt be saved.' In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise.

"Again this coming Church must have some kind of organisation. Can there be any better organisation than a flexible one, adjusting itself to passing environments, in Italy, in America, now in the twentieth century, hereafter in the thirtieth? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise. Again this coming Church must have some prescribed mode of admission. Can there be any better mode of admission than the rite of baptism, a rite which, as scholars in all communions admit, originally meant immersion? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise. Again this coming Church must have some form of government. Can there be any better form of government than the Presbyterian, a form which is natural to all executive bodies? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise. Again this coming Church must have some kind of headship, for all living things tend to some kind of presidency, or co-ordinating centre. Can there be any form of headship more historic or more decorous than the Anglican? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise. Again this coming Church must have some method of working, a method which shall be at once systematic, co-operative, effective. Can there be any method of working more systematic, co-operative, or effective than the Methodist? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise. Again this coming Church must have some kind of liturgy, for worship instinctively seeks to express itself in forms that are at once stately and apposite. Can there be any better liturgy than a flexible one, judiciously blending the stateliness of ancient prescribed forms and the appositeness of modern free adjustments? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise. Again this coming Church must have some term of communion, a term that shall be common to all Christ's people. Can there be any better term of

communion than communion with our Lord Jesus Christ as being the head of His Church or body, and therefore intercommunion with all Christians as being members of His body? In agreeing to this no one makes any compromise."[1]

"I hope my brother will pardon me for interrupting, though only for a moment," said Baptizo. "I wish to remind him that even compromise at times may be a good thing. Of that we have a Scriptural example in the first general council at Jerusalem whose conclusion, we are told, 'seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' As it included the writers of pretty much all the New Testament, and as we are definitely told it had the indorsement of the Holy Ghost, it has a higher attestation of inspiration than any other passage in the Bible. It was the result of a full discussion between the two great parties in the Early Church, and was a temporary compromise made for the sake of avoiding a schism. Then believers were told that they would do well if they would avoid four things—fornication, things offered to idols, things strangled, and blood. Of those prohibitions one stands, because founded in our moral nature. The other three were but temporary, and two of them are never mentioned again in the Bible. St. Paul, who submitted for the time for his brothers' sake, within ten years taught that things offered to idols might be eaten if nobody objected. Here is one great illustration and example of a holy compromise for the sake of unity."[2]

" 'T is well, my Brother," replied Bapto. "I will not dispute the facts nor disregard the lesson, but to continue. I was about to remark that this coming Church must be built on co-operation as a unified engine which does its work because its several parts, all different, are working in recognised adjustment and harmonious co-operation for a common end. If one pin give way or one valve refuse to work the whole is helpless. We have each been given our mission. That of the Roman Catholic is to give play to the bodily

[1] George Dana Boardman. [2] William Hayes Ward.

side of our nature, and this it does by its appeal to the senses in the way of architecture, statuary, painting, music, colours, forms, and nobly is it fulfilling its sensitive vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Presbyterian branch of the one Church is to give play to the theological side of our nature, and this it does by the prominence it assigns to creed and catechetical instruction, and nobly is it fulfilling its sturdy vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Congregational branch of the one Church is to give play to the personal side of our nature, and this it does by its insistence on the right of each congregation to ecclesiastical independence, and nobly is it fulfilling its manly vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Anglican branch of the one Church is to give play to the worshipful side of our nature, and this it does by the prominence it assigns to liturgy and æsthetics, and nobly is it fulfilling its devotional vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Methodist branch of the one Church is to give play to the active side of our nature, and this it does by the vigour of its ecclesiastical system, and its recognition of the lay element in its worship, and nobly is it fulfilling its robust vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Quaker branch of the one Church is to give play to the passive side of our nature, and this it does by its doctrine of inner light and by its disuse of forms, and nobly is it fulfilling its placid vocation. A chief distinctive mission of the Baptist branch of the one Church is to give play to the exact side of our nature, and this it does by demanding literal obedience to the Scriptural ordinance of Baptism, and nobly is it fulfilling its stalwart vocation. Thus each has its own peculiar mission and each, I doubt not, would be benefited by some absorption of the peculiarities of the others. For instance, Baptists, I am sure, would not be harmed by a little infusion of the Presbyterian polity, the Anglican æsthetics, the Methodist discipline, or the Quaker simplicity."[1]

[1] George Dana Boardman.

"All of which is very simple in words," remarked Representative, "but still the practical question remains, How?"

"It is a big job," said Puritan. "In undertaking it, we might feel as would a savage who had been shown a mighty modern ocean steamship and been told to at once substitute that class for his dug-outs or canoes. And yet it is necessary to undertake it. The spectacle we present is our undoing. By it we lose the respect which should be ours, particularly from the young. As law presents a united front is law respected. What more impressive than a village in a Roman Catholic country with its one central and strong Church, and with its religion taken as a matter of course. Two hundred or so years ago the same conditions existed in New England. All passed through one porch to a united worship. To-day the school children go through one school-house door on week days, but on Sundays they scatter through variously labelled doors, at each of which men are asking them to enter. So comes the idea that religion, unlike education, is a matter of debate. But I have a practical plan to submit."

"Your plan, Puritan," demanded the Moderator.

"I pray you hear me for one moment," interrupted Greatheart. Notwithstanding the fact that the Moderator had ruled that Puritan should be heard, a glance from Charity was sufficient to change the decision and the unfolding of the proposed plan was deferred so that Greatheart's request might be granted.

RHO

East, West, Hame 's Best

GREATHEART, on being accorded permission to speak, did not at once do so, but stood silent, as if undecided what to say, or as if affected by some deep feeling which would not permit him to express himself. At length he spoke:

"I am, Sire, of all men most miserable, because I feel that I shall be looked upon as a traitor. After all my expressions of goodwill to others who think not as I do, when the time comes for some definite action for a better fellowship with these my fellow Christians, I weaken, I cannot help it, and I am ready to draw back. I cannot express my feelings or state why I feel as I do. I am indeed most miserable and on account of my unworthiness. I have put my hand to the plough and am ready to turn back. I cannot approve of this great national Church as outlined, and why?

"The reason, as I find by self-examination, is that I am selfish and not willing to give up my own. In other words, I love mine own best."

"You too, Brutus," said Radic.

"It is nothing to be wondered at," said Militant, "the most natural thing in the world. He has the true *esprit de corps*. He loves the standard under which he fights. Only a man without a country would dream of going in search of the most beautiful of all flags in order that he might make it his own. Instinctively he cheers the flag he was born under, because for that reason he has always thought of it

as his flag. And I have always found that those who are the most devoted to their own particular service make the best soldiers."

"And it is so with Christians," said Conservative. "To my knowledge those who have been most devoted to their own branch of the Church have been the most liberal toward the beliefs of others. Cheer up, Greatheart. We all respect you the more for your scruples."

"Would I could think otherwise, Sire," continued Greatheart. "Even if I were to believe some one else right and myself wrong, how can I give up my birthright and my lifelong associates and go among strangers, and I am sure there are others of my opinion. My Church is mine by birth, baptism, and education and I love her. I could not feel at home in another Church or know what to do in a service to which I was unaccustomed. I cannot go to Mass, for I have not the slightest idea what it all means, nor could I be at home in the service of Anglic."

"They are both the same, Brother," said Radic. "The one in English suits me better, but there is too much up and down motion—seating, rising."

"As my further excuse," continued Greatheart, "my family into which I was born must necessarily be the one which commands my first duty. Where that family lives is my home, which to me is better than my neighbour's though I like to see my friends. I like a sociable neighbourhood. Let my friends come and live near me and I shall be delighted, but don't ask me to go back on the homestead. Cannot we be neighbours, provide schools in common, have social gatherings, be neighbourly in sickness and bereavement, without wearing our welcome out by intruding ourselves daily where we do not belong? It is not usually necessary to work our neighbour's field or tend his flock. That is his business unless he is sick. Each cultivates his own and takes what is coming to him. We might even look well to division fences without hard feelings, and we don't need to call names over them. Why should I call

the man on the other side of the fence a papist, or he call me a heretic? He loves his as I do mine, and how can I blame him? I respect him for it. Our families are little circles bound by the strongest ties. My Church is but a larger family. I and my wife are a unity and yet we are two different people. That does not prevent us from living together. It is not necessary that we should be alike. We are counterparts."

"Yes, Brother," interrupted Radic, "and you don't care to buy your neighbour's wife a gown as often as your own. That would not promote peace or unity."

"I was about to ask," continued Greatheart, "in connection with this suggestion of dissimilar counterparts, whether it is necessary to have uniformity in order to have Church unity? A Church unity involving uniformity I am afraid of. The very idea of unity should involve parts which are not necessarily similar. Must we have uniformity in worship? Must we always agree in opinion? Even Paul withstood Peter to the face.

"There are splendid men in all churches. But with all their help, no matter what plans we make for unity, something will always go wrong when we come to try them. Some one will always be found who will take advantage. Better not attempt this thing. Leave it to God. Our part is not to hinder."

"Yes," said Pilgrim, "while the outward disagreements among Christians are the standing scoff of infidels and often the cause of deep sorrow to believers, yet I am not sure but that they have answered a good purpose in the spread of religion in the world. When in the Early Church Paul and Barnabas disagreed upon a question relating to their work, and contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder, the result was a wider diffusion of Christianity than if they had laboured together. So without doubt the rivalry between different bodies of Christians has to some extent been the means of provoking each other to good works and to the spread of the knowledge of sal-

vation. I also, like Bapto, think we have each had our mission, and, besides, it seems to have been left to each body to devote itself to the development of some one or more doctrines or views of truth, and thus the whole field of religious truth has been more carefully studied than it otherwise would have been; on the same principle that better clocks are made by what is called the division of labour, than when one workman made the whole clock. But while these and possibly other benefits have been derived from the breaking of Christendom, I cannot but think that the present state of affairs will come to an end; that gradually, as Christ's religion spreads, the truths of the Bible become better understood, and all Christians come to understand each other better, they will draw nearer to each other and will begin to lay aside the non-essentials in which they disagree."

"I am with you, Greatheart," said Method, "in thinking that a man could do the best work in the Church in which he was born and brought up. I believe what my mother did. That 's a good reason."

"But," begged Greatheart, when he could again be heard, "cannot we all become as one and yet stay what we are? Cannot we agree to disagree? I do not want this Church unity. As I have said, I am afraid of it. Christian unity is enough for me. Our various sects may be tares or wheat, but let both grow together until the harvest. Then the question will not be one for us to decide."

"Have you anything further to offer, Greatheart?" asked the Moderator.

"I have said what I could. Would that I could say more," was the reply.

"Then we are ready to hear the plan of Puritan."

SIGMA

One—of Many

"My plan," began Puritan, "exactly meets the objection of Greatheart. It does not include absorption. From what we have learned here it would seem that we are not yet ready for Church unity. Our unity of states has been referred to. It must not be forgotten that the unity was not secured without something preliminary. Previously those states confederated. That is what we want, Federation. The states agreed, while separate and dissimilar communities, to respect each other's rights and to maintain their several independencies, but to work together for certain ends. This we can do. Then the final result was a more binding union. Whether we may expect such an outcome remains to be seen. At least we shall be in the way leading to it. My personal opinion is that even if my plan should fail in its ultimate object, Federation, for our purposes, would be good enough in itself."

Here Puritan was interrupted by a former witness, Earnest:

"It seems to me that if an organised Federation is proposed, to be accomplished by the creation of the machinery of organisation, representation, councils, and the like, it would be an attempt to secure a union which could have no real basis and which would be in the nature of a truce and not of a peace. If one is impatient of delay and eager for visible results, Federation promises a short road to the desired end, but it ignores differences which must ultimately

assert themselves. Behind any such expedient always lies the greater and more difficult question of Church unity, the real and vital question which we must answer sooner or later, and all attempts to put it aside and accept some substitute are sure to fail eventually."

"Then, Brother," resumed Puritan, "for your sake, we will look at it in the nature of a temporary expedient,—a means. The union of states was finally consummated by such an expedient. They gradually found what they had in common which could be entrusted to a central government, which things were so entrusted, and what was not so specifically entrusted was specifically retained as belonging to the individual states. Within itself each state was supreme and retained its autonomy. All that was specifically delegated to a central government became the supreme law which was cheerfully recognised and obeyed by all, and without detriment to the separate organisations which were the component parts. Each state co-operated to maintain the supreme law and for the mutual good, without any one claiming a supremacy over the rest. In that we have a model for our Federation. It is the most practical and possible present endeavour. It would at least be an improvement. Wherever such a plan has been tried in our Church affairs, and to whatever degree, it has shown gratifying results, therefore it gives promise for the immediate future. It would tend to make the barriers useless and if they were found so to be they would soon disappear."

"The proposed plan," said Pilgrim, "might be said to be a plan for intercommunion rather than unification. If I had my way I should make undenominationalism a dead issue. Christians have no use for a common denominator. They want to find the greatest common measure. I do not think that one great corporate body could do as much good as a number of separated organisations federated.[1]

[1] The underlying principle of true federalism seems to be that things which are better done jointly than severally are done by the organisation as a unit; and, conversely, those best done severally are done independ-

I shall work for this Federation. But we should work gradually, beginning with the points of least resistance and not, as we have been trying to do, with those of greatest resistance. We have been trying to surmount our greatest stumbling blocks first. But we must not forget that, as in the case of the colonies, there first came the sense of a need for closer relationship, both on account of the evils of a separate life and the advantages of a closer relation. Then came Federation. Each colony was still jealous of its rights, surrendering as little as possible to the common federated life. But they placed themselves in the historic process of fusion and every hour was moving them on towards that goal. Common wants, common needs, common dangers multiplied, until at last the conviction was forced home, 'United we stand, divided we fall.' The full sense of one indivisible national life came only after the terrific heats and the volcanic shakings of the Civil War."[1]

"An excellent plan," commented Radic. "How else can we suit the ideas of Earnest with his showy vestments

---

ently by each of the constituent tribes or denominations. Obviously, mutual agreement between the denominations and the Ecclesia members of the whole would from time to time decide into which category any new branch of effort should fall.

So far, however, as the two oldest and immeasurably most important of all the agencies of "the Ecclesia of God" are concerned, (*a*) evangelisation and (*b*) pastoral and teaching work, the maximum of spiritual results would, in the writer's view, be obtained by placing the former within the federal and the latter within the tribal sphere; evangelisation being promoted jointly by an interdenominational committee, and pastoral and teaching work severally by the various folds or denominations of the flock. . . .

Winging our way from New Testament times across the long centuries of departure from apostolic governmental principles, we would say: If our Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian, and other "folds" of the flock would be content to justify their several systems as denominations only, no one could join issue with them; for every tribe is free to adopt whatever church polity gives it most comfort and satisfaction.—From *Christian Reunion*, by Frank Spence. London. Hodder & Stoughton.

[1] J. H. Earle.

and those like myself who prefer the preacher to officiate in a frock coat and nicely creased trousers, or, if he gets down to real work in a camp meeting, in his shirt sleeves?"

"Something of the kind suggested," said Presbus, "is necessary and seems most practicable. How else can we agree? For instance, my strong point is doctrine. My friend Anglic, in order to maintain the reputation of his Church as being the roomiest Church in Christendom, tells me that polity and authority are of more importance than doctrine, that differences in doctrine come from individual free thought and must exist until we get more light. But we can get along together if he respects my opinion and I respect his. Some of Luthrem's friends exclude from Church membership all who belong to oath-bound secret societies. But that is all right, for they hold fellowship with those who permit such membership. Why should not Anglic hold to episcopacy and yet believe that others who do not so hold may be Christians and have the Christian faith?"

"No reason at all, Brother Presbus," said Anglic.

"Then that settles it," returned Presbus. "Only remember that we are living in the twentieth century and in the United States of America."

"After all," said Conservative, "it is not our sectarianism which appeals. We pursue many lines of religious activity which have no relation to the sectarian principles which we stand for. If the nomenclature of sectarian theology or sectarian ecclesiasticism were strictly adhered to and made the sole basis of the appeal that each special organisation makes for support, the answer to that appeal would be extremely limited and ineffective."

"I agree to that," said Anglic. "The arguments by which the success of sectarianism seems to be justified are always found to rest on those final principles of the Gospel of Christ which give no ground whatever for contentment with or satisfaction in a mutilated Church. No sect in

America to-day justifies itself by its success in impressing its special tenets as a sect on the religious life of the country. Even the legal title of my American Church, and the accepted abbreviation of that title, are inadequate, not to say ludicrous, if used to indicate what that Church is undertaking to do by its ministry and its organisation. Even a bishop in every parish on Sunday, and a weekly sermon on the religious history of the sixteenth century with a solemn chanting of the Thirty-nine Articles and a coincident anathematising of the decrees of the Council of Trent would not be enough to win the distinction of being really Protestant Episcopalian.

"The failure of sectarianism is the result of its inability to work out its own programme of isolation and separation in the face of the principles of a common humanity and a common Christianity. Complete sectarianism might be practiced with some success only in an isolated religious community, existing in a savage country, without a government and without any sovereign power in control. As sectarianism appears to-day it is a compromise, and its successes are due to its spirit of compromise. Each of these variously named organisations already partly occupies a wide territory on which it comes in touch with some other organisation, where both work, if not concordantly, at least without antagonism. The demand for closer co-operation or for federation rests as much on conditions as it does on ideals. It is the working out of the ideal on the basis of actually existing facts.

"From the first ages of the Church there was diversity. Without diversity there can be no real unity. For unity is not the same as identity. A sect works for identity. The course of religious history for several hundred years has shown, however, that the Christian temper attains its highest expression not through identity but through unity. On the limited field of sectarian history this fact has been demonstrated time and time again. There is no reason to fear that the Christian character in the individual or in

society will suffer by carrying to further limits the already existing harmony among the various churches."[1]

At this point there was a pause in the proceedings. For the moment no one wished to be heard.

"Would any one discuss further this plan proposed by Puritan?" asked the Moderator.

Again there was a pause.

"May I make a practical suggestion?" It was the Plain Business Man who spoke. "It may be said that we have a complaint, the cause of which we do not know. When such a thing happens to me, what do I do? The most practical thing. I call a doctor. That is what we should do now. I have noticed in this audience one whose intimate knowledge of the hidden interior of my body I most deeply respect. He has instruments of precision by which he can see within me what others cannot. He has a piercing eye which has often given me the idea that he can see through me without his instruments and I verily believe he can. At least he makes good guesses at times as to what goes on within. Now I admire him not only for his knowledge and abilities, but also for his common sense. Even were he not a doctor I am sure he could help us. He is a man posted in our present difficulties and interested, or he would not be here. If he could be prevailed upon to apply his methods to the settlement of our difficulties as Christians, as he would attend to our bodily ailments, we should profit by his wisdom. He stands without, for he is modest. He would never offer advice of his own initiative."

"If he is among you, let him speak," said the Moderator.

There was no response.

"Is this doctor here?" demanded the Moderator. "Let him be called."

"The Doctor, the Doctor," came from various parts of the assembly.

Then after an interval, a figure was seen moving slowly

[1] John Fulton.

from the outer edges of the throng, as if unwillingly impelled by some hidden force which could not be controlled. The figure was that of a man most unassuming in appearance, seemingly diffident, but with a kindly face and prepossessing mien. When he at length faced the Moderator, he asked:

"What can I do for you?"

"You may give us the benefit of your wisdom."

"To the extent of my ability, Sire."

TAU

He hath Sent me to Heal the Broken-Hearted

THE Doctor began as follows:

"We have been trying to cure a disease by presenting its symptoms. The symptoms are sectarianism. That is not the disease. Back of that, deep down, or far within, there is something which is producing the symptoms. We should reach that and the symptoms will disappear. I may not be able to help in that. It may take a greater physician than I am, but I do not say that it may not be reached. I might point out what it is, but my opinion is that these proceedings will develop that information.

"Part of our difficulty, however, comes from a confusion of terms. Accuracy in statement is necessary to a correct diagnosis. We have been confusing Christian and Church unity. Now we confuse a unity with a unit. Some think they desire a unit. I think they desire a unity.

"Consider for a moment the difference between them. A unit is a single one, surveyed externally, in isolation from other ones; a unity is a single one, surveyed internally, in its parts, each and every part being in mutual adjustment to a common end. A unit is a bare one, a unity is the coordination of several different ones into a state of oneness. A unit is one in the sense of numerical singleness, a unity is one in the sense of harmonious pluralness. For example: a molecule of water, considered in its wholeness and in distinction from other molecules of water, is a unit; but the

same molecule of water, considered in its composition as made of eight weights of oxygen and one weight of hydrogen, is a unity. But unity implies something more than harmonious variety of parts; it also implies the subordination of these various parts to a common end. It is this co-operation of diverse parts to a common end which makes these diverse parts as a whole a unity. For example: the separate blocks in a stone-yard are not a unity, they are only units; but actually bring them together and fit them to one another in due shape and order for the purpose, say, of a temple structure, and they become a unity. In brief, it is the co-ordination of diverse units for a common end which makes a unity. Unity consists in converged diversities, where all the ends are means and all the means are ends.[1]

"The knowledge gained in my profession which has to do with the well-being of the body, is applicable to the question before us. This is admirably set forth by one of the Apostles. Pardon me if I quote what we have all already memorised, but it more accurately expresses than any words of mine can, the idea I would convey.

" ' For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members, every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need

[1] George Dana Boardman.

of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary. And those members of the body which we think to be less honourable, upon these we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need: but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honour to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular.'

"From this I reason on the one hand, that the term 'body' implies 'members'. And 'members' imply specific functions. Observe how this is exemplified for instance in the idiosyncrasies of the various nations; each nation having as truly as though it were a hand or a foot, its own specific place or part in the great *corpus* or body of mankind. Recall, for example, Hebrew devoutness, Egyptian gravity, Assyrian force, Greek culture, Roman jurisprudence, Italian æstheticism, German philosophism, French *savoir-faire* Chinese conservatism, African docility, Swiss patriotism, Scandinavian valour, Spanish dignity, Russian persistence, English indomitableness, Scotch shrewdness, Irish impetuosity, American versatility. Each nation has its own rôle definitely assigned it in the great drama of history.

"On the other hand, the term 'members' implies 'body.' This is what constitutes the nations one vast 'solidarity', the peoples one colossal *corpus*.[1]

"Now if we apply the great analogy between the human body and Christ's body, which I have quoted, to these differing parts of Christ's body here represented we may begin with the head. Our friend Anglic here claims to be the head."

[1] George Dana Boardman.

"Not so, Doctor," interrupted Anglic. "Christ is the head according to Scripture."

"Do you not claim to be the part on which hands were laid?"

"A hit, a palpable hit," said Greatheart. "And what part may I be said to represent, Doctor?"

"You, friend Greatheart, are a part diseased. I should say that you were afflicted with cardiac hypertrophy, or in English, a diseased enlargement of the heart."[1]

"Is it serious, Doctor?"

"Exceedingly."

"Is it contagious?"

"Both contagious and infectious. It may become epidemic."

"Necessarily fatal, Doctor?"

"No, but it is not good for the system. It prevents activity on practical lines and interferes with accurate vision."

"How should I treat it?"

"In your case I am afraid it is in the blood, from birth; but others should beware of you. I think, however, that you are improving, for, as I understand, you are now just beginning to recognise the fact, the necessity and the worth of diversity."

"You approve then, Doctor, of the plan which Puritan has submitted?" said the Moderator.

"So far as it is in the line of co-operation, which I believe the correct method, I do.

"As co-operation is a law of life for the diverse members of the physical body, so co-operation is a law of life for the diverse members of the spiritual body or Christ's corporate Church. And diversity is absolutely necessary to co-operation. Our Divine Head does not demand from the members of his body uniformity of creed or uniformity of polity, for that would be to merge all members of his body into one

[1] George Dana Boardman.

vast cyclopean eye or one vast colossal foot. If the whole body were a Presbyterian eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were a Baptist ear, where were the smelling? If the whole Church were one gigantic denominational member, where were Christ's many-membered body? But now they are many members, yet but one body. And the Anglican eye cannot say to the Methodist hand, I have no need of thee, or again the Lutheran head to the Waldensian feet, I have no need of you. For all Christians constitute the one body of Christ, and each Christian is a functional member thereof. And the body of Christ is healthy and effective in proportion as each Christian discharges his own organic function; all the members, whether eye or hand, ear or foot, sinew or nerve, bone or cell, working together in reciprocal co-operation."[1]

"What is your advice, Doctor, as to the best way of attaining this co-operation?" asked the Moderator.

"I am accustomed to write my prescriptions so that they may not be misunderstood, and after due deliberation."

"Have you deliberated on this?"

"I have, Sire, most deeply and have been here watching the symptoms daily."

"You are then prepared to advise?"

"Yes, Sire."

"Do so then, and in writing as you suggest," directed the Moderator.

"It is already written, Sire, and here it is. It however is not easily compounded, for its most important ingredient is hard to obtain."

The witness produced a paper which he held in his hand for a few moments as if undecided what to do with it.

"Let Representative read it, and aloud," directed the Moderator.

Representative took the paper and looked at it. Then speaking to the Moderator, he said:

[1] George Dana Boardman.

"It is in what is to me an unknown tongue, I cannot read it. Perhaps Anglic may be able to read it."

The paper was passed to Anglic, who said:

"I am not able to read it. It is in a dead language. It seems more like the tongue with which Romanus is familiar."

"Will Romanus read it?" asked the Moderator.

"Alas, your Eminence," replied Romanus, "I dare not read it."

"Perhaps, Doctor, you will yourself translate it," suggested the Moderator. The doctor again took the paper and rewrote it.

"What shall be done with it, Sire?" he asked when the writing was completed, "shall I read it?"

"Perhaps as yet it would be as well not to read it. Let our Charity receive this document and retain it for the present until he has our further orders."

The paper passed to the keeping of Charity, Greatheart being the messenger who conveyed it.

"Is it your pleasure, Sire, that I look at it?" inquired Charity.

"By all means. Acquaint yourself with it and give us your opinion."

Charity unfolded the paper, examined the writing, and refolded it; a smile expressive of deep satisfaction spreading over his countenance as he did so.

"It is not necessary to ask our Charity whether he thinks it of value. His looks give the information. You have our thanks, Doctor," said the Moderator.

"If anything of mine may be made serviceable," replied the Doctor, "it will have made me most happy to have had the opportunity. I beg you will now excuse me."

"If we may not profit by more of your valuable knowledge, we shall be obliged to let you go," returned the Moderator.

"I have other practical ideas to submit, beside my sugges-

tion that you call the doctor. May I be heard?" The request came from the Plain Business Man.

"Most certainly," replied the Moderator. "If your ideas are all as good as that one, they will be of value indeed."

"Shall I then speak at once?"

"That will give us great pleasure."

UPSILON

Rich in Saving Common-Sense
And, as the Greatest only Are,
In his Simplicity Sublime

"I AM a blunt man and speak to the point," began the Plain Business Man. "I try to speak so that I may be understood and in as few words as possible. My ideas aim for things practical. You must excuse me if I am not very connected nor particular as to proper order.

"So far, only one definite plan has been suggested which though approved by some has also met with opposition except it be considered only as a means to an end. But we might agree on that as the best we can do at present.

"However, I have several practical suggestions to make. Here is one, I make it only as a suggestion to note how it may be received. If it does not please, I have others. To explain:

"I have here a letter which I have drafted, addressed to the powerful head of a powerful church, which I propose that we all approve and send to its destination. The letter is so addressed to one whom we call the Pope. We should address him because he is powerful. It reads as follows:

" 'Can you not rise to the occasion and call a meeting of representatives of all Christians to discuss, with a view to future action, the necessary steps to restore to Christianity that splendid influence it once exerted upon humanity, but of which it is in danger of being deprived by our unhappy

divisions, which now paralyse its power and, but for the promise of its perpetuity, would threaten its very existence.

"'Such a meeting as this, called by the Pope, at this critical juncture would thrill all Christendom to the centre with hope and joy.

"'Such a beginning would be taken as an earnest of better things to come, and all Christians everywhere would begin again, as in the early days of Christianity, to look to Rome as a leader in the great forward movement of humanity towards its final goal of redemption from the power of evil.'"[1]

Pilgrim here asked permission to remark:

"To many Protestants it might seem preposterous to imagine that such a call from the Pope of Rome would be responded to by all branches of the Christian Church. But is not Rome, the centre from which the Gospel of Christ radiated through much of the world in the first Christian century, the fit place for such a meeting, and is it unreasonable to think that the Bishop of Rome may recognise that this may be the greatest opportunity of the Church in modern times?"[2]

"I would also beg permission to remark," said Romanus, "that personally I wish to express sympathy with the author of this suggestion in which his sincerity is evident, but I do not see how it would be productive of the results he anticipates. If such a meeting were possible, would the Protestants there represented be willing to approve of and accept the means for creating and perpetuating Christian unity which Christ himself furnished?

"Until the various sects are willing to accept the teachings of the Church which was Divinely commissioned, the work of disintegration will steadily go on. Sincere Protestants may deplore the results of this disintegration as manifested in the loss of faith in Christianity itself, but there is

[1] Letter to Pius X. sent Christmas Day, 1906, by James Steptoe Johnson, P. E. Bishop of Western Texas.

[2] *The Congregationalist* and *Christian World.*

no help for it. Protestantism did its best to destroy the Christian unity that existed from the days of Christ and His Apostles, and now it has only itself to blame for the sad results."[1]

Method here spoke also:

"The churches of Anglic, both in England and here have determined that they will not recognise the validity of ministers not ordained by bishops of their own churches, the Roman Catholic Church or the Greek Church. The pope will never give up his supremacy, neither will he ever be reconciled with the Greek Church unless it will accept that supremacy. A meeting of all great religious bodies if called by the pope, could not be representative. The issues are too sharp. The Roman Catholic dreams that all other bodies will finally disintegrate and that a large part of Protestantism will affiliate with his Church. But the irresistible force and the unmovable obstacle exist, and it is better for each communion having principles for which it would die, to continue spreading its own views as widely as it can."[2]

As Method spoke the face of Charity showed that he was troubled. Seeing this Greatheart spoke.

"I am sorry to hear that Method has lost some of the pleasantness of speech which I had observed he had gained under the improving influences with which he is here surrounded."

"Never mind, Greatheart," responded Method suddenly, as if recovering from some hidden attack of bodily infirmity, "it will be all right presently. Give me time."

"Then," resumed the Plain Business Man, "as I understand it, this plan don't go. Now for the next suggestion.

"I can't say that I particularly hanker after the Federation plan unless it is distinctly and positively understood that it is only as a means to an end. It has been tried in a

[1] *Freeman's Journal* (Roman Catholic).

[2] *The Christian Advocate* (Methodist Episcopal).

smaller way. After great effort union organisation has been perfected, but as soon as any one of the constituents could muster a sufficient number to barely exist apart, off they went.

"This fusion plan is much like a fusion ticket. As a business man I have always voted a straight ticket. It means organisation, solidity, and business. The fusion people don't stick. They are not in it for keeps. They talk, that is their forte. Then they go and vote straight tickets, but on the sly. Romanus here will vote any ticket that suits his purpose if he can mark it with the sign of the cross.

"We are in a mess sure enough. The wonder is that any good work is done at all. Now if I might give my private opinion about several things, I would say that my idea of duty is that it consists in doing what lies nearest to us. In other words let us begin at home and each one begin with himself first.

"We make much of our differences and we think of them as if they were all equally important. We ought to distinguish between those essential and those not essential. It makes little difference for instance, in my opinion, whether in baptism we apply water to the candidate or apply the candidate to the water.[1] The quantity of water also is unimportant. A small quantity on the top of a man's head may be the proper fashion now, even if once it was necessary to let it run out of his boots. Nor does it matter much whether the parson says Amen when he is ready to stop praying or the people say Amen when they are ready to have him stop. Many of our other differences are as unimportant. Does it matter much if we as Christians conform to the regulations of some who insist that our coats should button while others say that we should use those that have hooks, others again insisting that only those with loops are proper.

[1] Albert Temple Swing.

"Very often we make much of our differences because we know so little about those who differ. I acknowledge I have been mistaken at times myself. I went to Bapto's Church to find out about this water business. I was surprised to find he had carpets, and cushions in the pews, like some other Christians. Thought he was fitted up like Romanus for the common people, others being allowed if they put up a price suited to their abilities.

"We have a queer way of doing things anyway, and that 's the case here. We have brought you gentlemen, no, not men, I do not know what word to use, but you who comprise this important Commission, quite a distance, by praying for you, for the purpose of having you do something for us which it was entirely in our power to do for ourselves if we only wanted it done. The fact is we don't want it or we would do it. I 've heard Brother—— I won't mention his name—at a meeting called for that purpose, pray that the Lord would help raise an insignificant amount of money for missions. That brother could have drawn his check for many times the amount and never felt it. Why did he trouble the Lord about such a trifle? Men piously ask the Lord to undertake works by the score which they are too lazy or too penurious to do for themselves. The wonder is not that the heathens are not converted but that there are any Christians left. Men meet and pray and exhort, and then turn the whole business over into the Lord's hands with an air of pious resignation, contributing a dollar or two as they leave, as their share toward the enterprise.[1]

"It is a question whether we even pray. If we did the prayers would be answered. The utterances of words is not praying, to say nothing of transferring to the Lord in a few set phrases a piece of work which he has given us to do. I can't argue on prayer. That is not in my line. But I know we have been given the tools to work. Work first, talk afterward.

[1] Hugh Miller Thompson.

"Again, as to our queer ways, illogical some of my educated friends might call them.

"Most Christians believe in a religion by Divine revelation. How can this idea agree with denominationalism? Mediæval men put their faith in an infallible Church. Then the reformers pitted an infallible Bible against an infallible Church. Institutional Christianity was attacked by means of its own documents. The Continental Reformation was by individuals. They broke with the past. They went as far as to condemn their own Christian ancestors as Babylonish idolators,—the institutions which had preserved those documents, that Bible, for them—as Anti-Christian. They revolted against the Christian history of fifteen hundred years. They sought not to reform an old church, but positively to create a new.

"Now if Luther or Calvin can create a new church from the Bible, why cannot Francis Asbury or Alexander Campbell do the same? Why cannot Joseph Smith do it?

"Now if organic Christianity is an accident or a human contrivance, and a book is entirely sufficient without the institution out of which the book grew, then any man can come to the Book and start such institutions as it seems to him are suggested by the book.[1] That would all conform to the idea of private interpretation. Somewhere in the New Testament there is a story about a man, I suppose we would call him a 'nigger' to-day, who read Scripture and was asked by one whose business it was to interpret it if he understood what he was reading. 'How can I except some man should guide me?' was the reply.

"Hence comes the flood of modern denominations, 'Christian,' yes, but each with some half-truth of Christianity which it makes a falsehood by proclaiming it the whole. There is nothing but the Book and the individual. It is the individual's private wisdom or private ignorance about the Book. He does not know perhaps how the Book came,

[1] Hugh Miller Thompson.

how it was preserved, how it came to be in English, nor who put it so, whether its divisions into chapters and verses were made by inspiration or made by a printer, has perhaps a notion that the English Bible was dropped down from Heaven with the imprint of the Bible Society upon the title-page, and a list of the various books in front, but he will find something in it which he imagines is not taught sufficiently or emphasised sufficiently in his existing denomination. He will persuade others to his notion. They preach their little Gospel. They exaggerate it. They have no idea of the proportion of the Faith. They wave their imagined discovery over their heads as a little ragged sect-banner. They organise a society to secure the preaching of it,—they are 'a church.'

"They have developed their own Nemesis. The original Puritanism involved the germ of all sects. The claim of one set of men to be wiser and holier than others, involves the claim of another set of men to be wiser and holier than the first set. The separation of one set of men from another because those of the first set are too holy to live with those of the second involves the claim of a third set to separate because they are more holy still, and so it may go on *ad infinitum*.

"Institutions bear witness to the genuineness of the revelation in the Book. They are the only possible witnesses to those who were not eye-witnesses. The constitution and statutes of the United States did not make the United States. The United States made the constitution and the statutes. And while it is perfectly reasonable, and may be a solemn duty to criticise and arraign and condemn an existing administration of the United States by an appeal to the constitution and the laws, it would be a wild idea to undertake by them to destroy the United States, or set up upon their authority a new polity in rebellion. It would be a still wilder idea for each man, or any little group of men, to claim the right to make a hundred little 'United States' all over the country, on his or their conception of what best

fitted the said laws and constitution. Suppose beside, that the claim to imperial right, reverence and obedience, should then be made for each of these little associations,—that it is the United States, or perhaps has been the United States all along![1]

"Some part of that doctrine in national politics we have fought out to a finish. We may do so in national religion. That would look to me like business. When we had the political fight we settled several things which we had not thought at first we could settle. It may be so when we come to the religious line up. When we fought politically we settled the question whether the negro was ordained by God to work only for his board and keep, or for wages that will just about pay for his board and keep, if he is lucky in getting jobs and careful of his money.[2] When we come to our religious scrap we may settle whether God belongs to Americans or has anything to do with Rome or the Chinese or the Hindus or the Mohammedans,—whether the god of the heathen, made by hands and called his idol, is the same as ours which we call an idea.[3]

"But it is pretty poor business running these churches under our system. The fruits of competition are scant wages and scamped wares. Did you ever have to look to a vestry or Church trustees for your wages? I hope not. It is just throwing yourself away. As a parson you may be a fine man but in a mighty poor business. When you were in the Seminary, all on fire with high and holy enthusiasm for the souls of men, did you ever think it would come to trotting from hen-party to hen-party, from the Ladies' Aid to the Helping Hand, to rigging up catchpenny devices wherewith to get the winter coal, or pay the interest on the debt, to naming committees who should 'mace' the department stores and the neighbourhood groceries for contribu-

[1] Hugh Miller Thompson.

[2] Eugene Wood, in "The Gathering of the Churches." *Everybody's Magazine.*

[3] *Ibid.*

tions to the fancy-goods counter and the household counter, cash if you can get it, but if not something to sell chances on? I know that some won't allow chances to be sold at church fairs. They say it 's gambling. I don't admire a gambler greatly, but I guess I think full as well of him as I do of a beggar.[1]

"Outside of a square fight, how do you suppose we are going to settle these questions anyhow? I take it for granted they are going to be settled, for as a business man I cannot imagine that the good sense of my fellow citizens, who have intellects as good as mine, will allow us to stay as we are. Nor will they be content with a mere Federation except as a temporary measure. There is one way but that way is slow, you must give it time. That way is by general consent. That way has been used in the settlement of many important questions and it is more sure than by papal bull or decree of council. After it is done by that method, a council or bull may decree that is has been done. This method can come only by the cultivation of common sense. In that way gradually the truth with respect to vexed questions gets into the air and in time the thing is done. Now there is a way of expediting this method to a certain degree.

"To tell you this I will have to divulge a trade secret, one which I have made use of continuously, and by doing so I have secured most of the business success which has fallen to my lot.

"I don't like to mention names publicly especially when they are confidential. I will therefore indicate by initials. Any one whom the information particularly concerns may have further particulars privately.

"Well, know then that there is in existence a very influential personage whom we often hear of, but almost never see. He is retiring, so much so as to be almost a myth to some people. Now if you work on this person,

[1] Eugene Wood, in "The Gathering of the Churches." *Everybody's Magazine.*

cultivate his friendship, get him to think as you do, get him to talking, he can bring almost unlimited pressure to bear to bring to pass the thing desired. This person I always speak of as Mr. P. O.

"Now when I have had a lot of stuff on hand which has become unsalable because, for instance, it may have become unfashionable, I don't sell it at a loss but I speak about it to Mr. P. O. I tell him how much more desirable the goods are than others, how much more sanitary, how much cheaper. I might talk until doomsday without effect if I were to air these opinions generally, but once get Mr. P. O. interested so that he thinks as I do and speaks about it, then everybody believes him. Without him my words would be but empty air. I depend on him more than on advertising or any of the tricks of trade. I always consult him before starting any important undertaking. Now I have an idea, in fact I am convinced, that if you can influence Mr. P. O. on this Church question, we are at the end of our troubles. Try it. I 'll show you how. This is one of my plans, and it is the most important one I have to offer.

"I have however one other suggestion which I might put in the form of a prescription like the Doctor for I would like to have it in writing, large before men's eyes, as well as in their ears, so that it might make a stronger impression, I wish I had the facilities to so write it."

"The facilities shall be provided if the Moderator so wills," said Representative, "so that it may be writ large before the whole assembly."

"It is but a motto, a catchword, a rallying cry, easily written, easily read and easily remembered," continued the witness.

"If the witness will, he may do as is his wish," said the Moderator.

The facilities being provided the witness proceeded to imprint in large typographic characters but two words:

FORGET IT.

"That is my motto, Mr. Chairman" the Plain Business Man explained. "It indicates a way by which we may get over all our past misunderstandings, all our past unfriendliness, and start again, fresh, with a blank page. We may ignore everything that has gone before. We may begin with the fact that we are to-day Christians and begin anew, and for the future when we err—— Have you ever had anything to do with children? I have. When they do wrong, is it always the best thing to draw attention to every little thing and correct it on the spot? That is necessary at times. But more often, when we know we cannot control the situation, the best way is to take no notice and the offence is as if it had never been committed. That 's practical and that 's business."

PHI

It Is the Lord's Doings. Marvellous

THE Plain Business Man had hardly ceased speaking when several of the former witnesses were seen to be in consultation. After a slight delay and an inquiring look from the Moderator, Representative spoke:

"We would, Sire, propound a question but know not how we may do so without offence. We mean no disrespect but our earnest wish prompts us and is our only excuse. We think that our brother, Greatheart, from his known character, may better explain our wishes in a way which will not be misunderstood."

"I am sure," said Charity, "that Greatheart can so present the matter, and that anything that he may say could not possibly be wanting in respect."

"What is it, Greatheart?" inquired the Moderator.

"Without inferring, Sire, that we in our human weakness may presume to criticise the actions of the directing head of this Divine Commission, sent to us out of pure kindliness and for our eternal welfare, we cannot but confess to a certain feeling of disappointment at the course this inquiry has so far taken.

"We have been led to state our case, our grievances, to lament our difficulties. Then we have been persuaded to give our individual views as to how best we may overcome our troubles, in which we do not agree nor does it appear that we may do so.

"From your own words in the beginning we were led to

infer that from you might come our help. It might be more satisfying to those present if we could hear something to that effect directly from yourself, rather than that we should express our ideas as to how we propose to help ourselves."

"Now you 're talking business, Greatheart," shouted the Plain Business Man. "That 's what we want. Forgive me, Sir. I 'm a plain blunt man and believe in asking for what I want directly. I want plain direct answers from you to plain questions and I can tell you just what they are. Shall I?"

The Moderator made no reply and the Plain Business Man continued:

"I have them written and will read them.

"First. Are you personally interested in this subject of church unity?

"Secondly. Do you think the movement is gaining or dying out? Is there as much interest shown as formerly?

"Thirdly. Do you consider such unity desirable?

"Fourthly. Do you consider it practicable?

"Fifthly. Do you consider it essential?

"Sixthly. What do you consider the best plan for us to adopt to obtain it?

"Seventhly. What are the chief obstacles?

"Eighthly. Can you suggest any practical way to overcome such obstacles?

"Ninthly. What should we give up for the sake of unity?

"Tenthly. What is essential that we should not give up?

"Eleventhly. Is any one of our Churches more suitable than another as the basis for unity?

"Twelfthly. Should it be a close union or only a federation?

"Thirteenthly. What particular advantages would come from such union or federation?

"Fourteenthly. What branches of the Church should we include in this union and with what branches should we refuse to unite?

"Fifteenthly. Should the movement include only this country? If not to what countries might it be extended?

"Sixteenthly. Should it be confined to Protestants or should it include Catholics? What is your personal opinion of Rome?

"Seventeenthly. What is your opinion of the 'Historic Episcopate'?

"Eighteenthly. Do you approve of a liturgical Church and if so what is your opinion of ancient liturgical usages?

"Nineteenthly. Can you tell us who is best informed on the subject, man or woman, to whom we may apply?

"Twentiethly. Can you give us a list of the best books?

"Twenty-firstly. What is your favourite church connection?

"Twenty-secondly. Can you give any information not included in the above questions?"

At this point, the Moderator still keeping silent, Representative interrupted the reading by asking if there were many more questions to follow.

"Seventeen more," replied the Plain Business Man. "In this matter they are my thirty-nine plain business articles. Do you object to them?"

The Moderator and the other members of the Commission apparently paying no attention, the conversation continued.

"You see," said Representative, "that you are ignored, that being the kindly way to reprove you for your great presumption."

"If it is presumption, I apologise," was the reply. "I did not so intend it. It was my way of doing business, to the point."

"Then permit me to ask you to stop."

The Plain Business Man said nothing further. After an interval the Moderator spoke, directing his remarks to Greatheart as if he had last spoken.

"We can appreciate your feelings, good Greatheart, and would reply to you in detail. But before we do so we would

that you should hear one more witness. By the exercise of the supernatural powers that have been conferred upon us, we have compelled the attendance of one out of a class of many such, who we think may be able to give the information desired. Even now we see him approaching. If you but turn you may see him.

As the Moderator spoke, all present became conscious of the presence of one before unseen, who was making his way slowly and deliberately to where Greatheart stood facing the Moderator. Greatheart gave place and the new witness waited to be examined.

He was an old man with long white hair, pleasing to look upon, tall, of robust health and with a countenance which expressed a peacefulness of disposition such as could come only from a well-ordered, quiet, contented, and saintly life.

"We have called you for a purpose," said the Moderator, and it seemed as if there were unwonted tenderness and consideration in the tones. "Would it suit your convenience to state your name for the benefit of those who would hear you?"

Said the witness:

"I am called an Old Man. Will that suffice? My earthly name I shall bear but for a little while longer. In the hereafter, to which I now look continuously, I shall have a new name and I hope a glorious one, which it is not given me to know at present."

"So be it then," ordered the Moderator. "You shall be known as you wish, only as an Old Man. That will suffice. May we ask what is your present occupation?"

"I have none, may it please you, Sire, for so I am told I should address you, if I may qualify the statement by saying that I so mean it as referring to an earthly calling. The Divine Master has so blessed me with success that I am beyond the reach of earthly want so far as my present needs are concerned, but I am fully occupied. I have two important occupations which employ all my time, and as I have

but little of that remaining to me here, I try to make the best use of it."

"And your two occupations are?"

"One, for my own improvement, is looking forward to those things which are before, in which as I draw near to them I discover joyful things such as I have never known here. The other is my diversion and I call it retrospecting. That is the usual amusement of an old man."

"And what is your age as men measure it?" inquired the Moderator.

"I complete one hundred years this day, and I am convinced that it was on that account that the hidden influence, which suggested that I should present myself here at this time, has been urging me to do so.

"One hundred years," mused the witness as if to himself. "It is a long time. Many things have happened in those one hundred years."

"And yet," interrupted Charity, "though to you one hundred years may be a long time, you were not even alive when our Peace here was on this earth before, not by many of your centuries. Try to think as we do and consider that interval an extremely short time."

"Whether your life has covered a long or short interval, your retrospecting may be of value to us," observed the Moderator.

"I have always considered the faculty a valuable one," resumed the Old Man. "I think that power has been given us for a purpose, as the power to foresee has been withheld from us for our advantage. That, we with our earthly abilities could not stand. We have a horse that labours for us. When he goes out in the morning to work for us, he does not know, as we do, where we are going to drive him. He does not know the amount of work he will be compelled to do. If he did he would be discouraged and would not try to work at all. He would become stubborn. Little by little we lead him on to do what his strength will permit and the time will allow, and when we look back over the day we

are pleased that something worth while has been accomplished. So with us. When we look over a life of toil, when we consider all that it has been necessary for us to go through, we must admit that but few of us would not have recoiled had we known it all in advance. From this reflection I have gained a certain earthly wisdom, the application of which to my life has contributed much to my equanimity. It is embodied in our earthly proverb not to cross a bridge until you come to it."

"It is on account of this ability for retrospection which you have cultivated that we have wished for your presence here," said the Moderator. "Have you been interested in this question which is here before us, which concerns a greater oneness among the followers of the Master here on earth?"

"I did not know that the question was before you, for at my age I do not keep up with the latest in the world's occurrences, being too much occupied with the two things that concern me most. But that has been a question that has had my greatest interest in the past, in fact my greatest anxiety. Lately I have not worried to so great an extent, for it is the growing habit of those of my age who are at peace with the world, to make light of earthly troubles."

"Was it only from this growing habit that your anxieties were relieved, or had you other reason for this relaxation?"

"The habit assisted in the result, but it came also from a calm scrutiny of the past, in fact the process was a part of one of my occupations, looking backward."

"You are a Christian?"

"I so hope, and believe, Sire."

"Of what particular branch of Christ's Church?"

"I had almost forgotten, Sire, though I have been most deeply interested in my particular surroundings. But now I look forward to membership in a Church which follows no lines, which bears no name but Christ's, and which I hope to reach by the road I selected, mainly on the advice of those of mine own family who have gone before me, as others will

have reached it by their road. What difference does it make if they all centre alike? If you will kindly excuse me, I would not wish to recall my past feelings of distress over disagreements which are now forgotten, as I now strive to live at peace with all men. In fact it has always been my aim to avoid controversy with those of other communions, seeking rather to show them what good Christians they were and how much they thought as I did without knowing it."

"It is not necessary to disregard your wishes in this matter, but we would know what you discovered in your retrospect which led you to greater ease of mind concerning the matters which had before troubled you. You can recall the pleasant things without those unpleasant. You may find something encouraging to tell us."

"Sire, I will tell you all and to the best of my ability, for I think I understand your wishes and your object.

"I have been told that I should consider my span of life as a short one. It is, for your purposes. For mine, it is a long one. To see certain things on this earth a long life is necessary. Here is one. I have stood at the foot of a great river of solid ice on some one of our mountains, where it ended in broken ice, boulders of stone, crushed fragments of rock, and gushing water from the melting edges. I have noticed that certain points, certain earth formations, certain hillocks, certain houses, certain trees, had a fixed relation to the crumbling ends of this great glacier. Within a certain zone there is broken confusion. Beyond that on one side is unbroken ice, on the other fixed verdure. I revisit this spot several years later and find all as if unchanged, and yet I am informed that this mighty river of ice moves. How can I believe it? And yet, if I had seen it in my earliest infancy and could now behold it after an interval of one hundred years, I could readily believe it, for what a change would be there. Points of comparison would have altered, houses and trees would be gone, and the amount of motion could be measured. So it is in this matter. In my lifetime I can see a certain progress.

"As to this Church disunity from which we now suffer, that part of it which most vitally concerns us in this country, has originated in a period covering not more than four hundred years. There was no effort to do away with it until about fifty years ago and that was no very great effort. The effort has become more earnest only within a very few years and in that short interval it has had several accessions of impulse which at times added force and when exhausted they produced a return in the vibration. On each such rebound those interested raised the cry that the craze for Christian unity, as they called it, was over, or, as others spoke of it, the iridescent dream had passed. We may say that the retiring wave has spent itself when its force is swallowed up in a succeeding one, but the force and the effect of it may still be felt.

"But even in the time since serious effort was first made in this direction by my fellow countrymen, say in fifty years, what have I seen? Fifty years is not much time in which to undo all that has been wrongly done in four hundred years, but yet I can see some progress even in that short interval.

"Fifty years ago men were generally content that disunity should exist, in fact they reasoned that it was a good thing. They saw divisions without realising the evil and the sin. To-day there is general agreement that they are wrong and an earnest wish exists that they may be done away with. Unity is in the air. If, as I infer, this gathering has been called to help that purpose, the large numbers here present and their attentive interest would show that I am correct. It is but another instance of what I have before noticed, that in late years whenever a meeting is held for the purpose of discussing this subject, more attend than can be accommodated.

"Four hundred years ago the great impulse began which was away from the centre. Now the turn has come and the tendency is toward the centre. Before there was a

spirit of endless division and subdivision. Now there is a process of reconstruction and reintegration.

"I note too an increasing truly Christian temper in the discussion of our differences, and a willingness to concede praise for Christian virtues wherever found.

"There is in fact a growth in Christian virtue itself. As a greater thing than uniformity, it is now considered that pure religion and undefiled should uphold its Scriptural standard. At no previous period of the Church's history has greater stress been laid upon the essential of clean hands and pure hearts for those standing in God's holy place.

"Christians of every name are coming more and more to respect each other's conscientious convictions. Old-time controversies have given place to respectful consideration and sometimes even indifference as to former matters of disagreement, many of which indeed are now dead issues. We are learning more and more as Christians to co-operate in good works in certain lines, even those of us as far apart as Roman Catholics and Protestants. Those of us who are believers in the absolute infallibility and inspiration of every word of our translated Scriptures continue in Church fellowship with those who allow for human errors in author or translator. Those who minister to us in holy things are more and more passing unchallenged to and from one jurisdiction to another, as it may suit necessities, which I consider a thing in itself good and not a cause for discouragement.

"The Christian Church in this country is but just emerging into its manhood and is just about to take up its life's work. It has had a century of infancy, a century of childhood, a century of adolescence, and is now in its majority and just about in possession of its manly intellect, which it will use to the best effect. By the use of this intellect it will translate this disposition for unity into practical terms and without the sacrifice of principle. And it is more and more conceded that reunion will be effected by those who hold most firmly to their distinctive principles. Such men

can always respect each other. Half-hearted and doubtful men always distrust each other. A sentiment now exists that one may best show his loyalty to his own household of faith, not by reiteration of the particulars in which it surpasses all other religious bodies in doctrine, order, and worship, but by the spirit of holiness, fraternity, and beneficence which it engenders in its members. It is conceded that while to sneer at the errors of others may cater to the pride of some, it will never convert a man or win him to the fellowship of saints.

"All this would go to prove that not only has there been no pause in the truly spiritual part of the unity movement, as shown by the fact that the bitterness of sectarian controversy has passed away and been replaced by a spirit of brotherly appreciation between members of different Christian bodies, which is stronger than ever before and growing in strength daily, but that there is no pause in the intellectual part of the movement. That too is going on with an increased momentum. Never before did the press teem as now with standard works of historical theology which show with the calmness of history what the doctrine and institutions of the Christian Church were when the Church was united, and so point clearly to the remedy for the present divisions. The study of those great original works has already done incalculable good. It has taken many matters of former dispute clean out of the field of controversy. In all Christian bodies a generation of students is coming rapidly forward for whom the sectarianisms of a generation ago will have no attraction.

"As a result of such study an increasing number of books has been produced whose direct object is to urge a greater unity and to find practicable means to bring it about. Not one has been written for the purpose of hindering it. These have given rise to discussions of the subject, all conducted without rancour or bitterness, in which the services of the newspaper press, the lecture platform, and the pulpit have been freely used.

"And when in such a truly Christian spirit as we now appear to cultivate, we examine into and become familiar with the beliefs of others, it becomes evident how much more we agree than we disagree. Baptism is virtually required in some form to enter any branch of the Christian Church. We mostly believe in an ancient creed. In some form we mostly believe in an atonement, in a regeneration, in a repentance, in a faith, and in such a love of God as will cause us to strive to glorify him by a well-ordered life. Anglic does not insist that a belief in episcopal ordination is necessary to salvation. Bapto does not deny that a man may be saved without immersion. Presbus will not say that belief in his catechism insures salvation, or a denial of some minor point of doctrine may prove fatal.

"We are just becoming conscious that while objecting to the infallibility of the Pope we have each been thinking ourselves infallible.

"We are developing three watchwords of unity. In the field of dogma, theological and ethical, that word is Condensation, in the field of polity, the word is Co-ordination, in the field of worship, the word is Classification,[1] so that each may have what he needs. This involves toleration. I see here one whom I suppose has testified, by name Earnest, who loves his candles and incense, who must be tolerated by me, but so must I be tolerated by him if I am to live with him, I, who, for all he knows, may hate such things.

"It is true that all three of these watchwords embody a stumbling-block, but they may not be insurmountable through toleration, judging by what has now been done. In dogma, we stumble at the grace which some affirm is conferred by sacraments. In polity, there is the value of historic orders which those who care nothing for them might tolerate for the sake of those who care much. In worship, those who do not believe in a mystical presence of

[1] W. R. Huntington.

Christ in the Holy Eucharist may tolerate those who do. In fact I can see such toleration growing, and in fifty years the progress is quite perceptible.

"As to polity I note a disposition in all to adopt and combine some form of all the three things which worked in harmony in the early Church, Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism and the thought is encouraging.

"I note also that the spirit of proselyting is on the decline, being replaced by the spirit which seeks only to do good.

"Our American Protestants have more and more been imitating the earlier Church and in some respects have made a better showing, in insisting that the Church's particular work shall include the school, the college, the hospital, and the nurse, and that they be of the highest grade of excellence. More attention is paid to the needs of the poor and the alleviation of misery. Later years show progress in that, where needed, the Church has included the bath tub as well as the font, the coffee-house and kitchen as well as the Holy Supper, and the gymnasium as well as the meeting for worship.

"Even the conservative Church of Rome shows progress. I imagine that much has here been said about its corruption. But read the denunciation of one of its early detractors[1] and reckon how many of the abuses which he denounces have been completely remedied."

"The outlook for unity as seen by the aged witness is encouraging," said Luthrem. "Looking backward as he does and in the same spirit, I also can readily see grounds for encouragement. I can instance a notable example within his lifetime in our native Germany."[2]

[1] *The Institutes of Calvin.*

[2] An organic union between the Lutheran and German Reformed Churches into which German Protestantism has been divided since the sixteenth century, was effected in 1817 in connection with the third centennial of the Reformation, under the lead of Frederick William III., King of Prussia and father of the first Emperor of United Germany.—Philip Schaff, *Reunion of Christendom.*

"In this country," said Presbus, "our communion furnishes an example of organic union at a much later date. There was a great division on doctrinal questions, and a reunion took place by a free and simultaneous process, on a basis of orthodoxy and liberty. We have prospered all the more since the reunion[1] and to such an extent that we have been encouraged to do away with another schism.[2] We are contemplating still greater things such as the union of those of our belief separated by sectional lines, North and South, on issues which no longer exist. When these fractures are healed we will be a truly magnificent body of American Christians in which any one may feel a pride. We may even look to a union with those of our faith whose home is in Canada where similar work has been done."[3]

"Yes," said Method, "that reminds me that our communion in Canada, which was formerly divided into five independent bodies, has now united into one organisation,[4] and I am told that there these reunited Methodists have still further merged with Presbyterians and Congregationalists. In this country we also look for a reunion of the Northern and Southern branches of our church."

"I can also see progress in our own country as well as Germany," said Luthrem. "We have two important branches[5] whose differences are daily becoming less emphasized and more nearly forgotten. And I concede with the aged witness, that even our old enemy Rome can move to a better Christianity, though the difficulties of any ultimate union with her have been greatly increased by modern dogmas such as those of papal absolutism and infallibility,

[1] The Old School and the New School divisions of the Presbyterian Church were formed in 1837 and reunited in 1869.

[2] The Cumberland Church.

[3] The four divisions of Presbyterians in Canada have forgotten their old quarrels and were united in one organisation in 1875.—*Philip Schaff.*

[4] In 1874.

[5] Popularly designated as New School and Old School, though correctly known by their synodical connection.

decreed within the interval covered by the retrospect. But of course, even if a pope's decrees are infallible, they can refer only to his own Church and can have no binding force on other Christians. If a pope under a higher influence, of such a kind as we have here had example, should infallibly decree his fallibility in all matters outside of his own communion, as I think has been suggested here, the door would not be shut in that direction."

"That matter has had my especial study," said the former witness Earnest, whom the aged witness had mentioned. "Infallibility amounts to nothing. It is confessed to be an abstraction which can never be concretely applied, since no one can tell when, or on what occasions, the utterances of the Pope are infallibly true."

"I think," said Radic, "that Rome does not progress. She stands still and by her we measure how far we have moved, as we measure the motion of the glacier by the stationary objects. She is not up to date. Witness a recent decree of an infallible pope against keeping the young clergy abreast of the times by a knowledge of current events."[1]

"There you are mistaken, Brother," returned Earnest. "Rome does move even with such hindrances. To-day a man of undoubted piety sits in the Papal Chair. That is progress, and it is in accordance with the statement made by the aged witness that we all now insist upon a pure clergy.

"Rome believes in transubstantiation, but Roman theo-

[1] Rome, Sept. 8, 1910.—Pope Pius X. to-day issued a *Motu Proprio* giving new and practical measures to be adopted against the growing modernist campaign.

The Pontiff reiterates all of the rules previously set forth against modernism, especially in the *encyclical pascendi*, and adds that the bishops and the rectors of Catholic colleges must watch attentively the development of the young clergy, seeing to it that they are well prepared to fight error, forbidding them to read newspapers and periodicals, and avoid distracting them from their studies.—*Associated Press Dispatch.*

logians are defining it in a sense which Cranmer would gladly have accepted. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception is found to mean nothing or less than nothing. The purgatory of the Middle Ages has no longer a place in the thoughts of enlightened Romanists. All these things show progress."

"Possibly," said Conservative, "the way to unity for Western Christendom does not lie, and probably never will lie, through the See of Rome. It does not follow however that some other way may not be opened. But it requires no power of prophecy to imagine a course of events which might easily, and within a short time, forever destroy the power of Rome to obstruct. In Italy the papacy is at deadly feud with the civil powers. In Spain, as the democratic spirit grows, Rome's influence wanes, and there, as in the Spanish republics of the Western world, her dominion is driving all progressive men into irreligion. In France her hold on the great mass of people is lost. Hungary treats her mandates with contempt. Austria has served notice that her conglomerate people will refuse obedience. The papacy itself as a government, not the Church of Rome, is at this moment in such a state of unstable equilibrium that no one would be greatly astonished if it were to be removed from Rome never to return. Over and over again in recent years this has been advised by the Pope's best friends, has been threatened by the Vatican itself, and it is said that the present incumbent of the Chair of Peter wishes it.

"At this stage of the world's history such a removal would obscure the glamour of the Apostolic See, though it might be for the best interests of the Roman Church. A removal to this country would put the centre of government where there is a purer and more enlightened portion of the Church and result in the election of pontiffs more in accord with liberal ideas. Under such an one, ideas of reunion, on some other basis than submission, might flourish unrebuked within that historic Church, and without violence to the

true though blind obedience which her faithful sons so cheerfully give to their lawful superiors in the faith. Who knows but what the more progressive members, once in a position to be heard, may demand that this Church, without injury to her centralisation, shall be free from all secular control and from the fatal dominion of the corrupt power which now surrounds and restrains the chief executive, no matter how sincere may be his piety. That would be progress indeed, though our controversy has ever been with the papacy, not with our American brethren who are subject to it, they in their faithfulness thinking it their duty to defend the cause of their governing hierarchy."

"You may ask," continued Conservative, "if the way to unity may not lie through the Oriental Church. As there is no representative of that body here present perhaps Anglic may give us his opinion."

"The way may so lie," replied Anglic, "but as it now appears it could not be immediately available. That which prevents is ignorance. We know but little of the spiritual life of our Eastern brethren and they know perhaps less of ours. We perhaps, in our English connection, are nearer to them than the Protestants of this country, but they confound our loved communion with the extravagances of the ultra-Protestantism and the modern rationalism of Germany. We find it difficult to believe that their veneration for Icons and their invocation of the Virgin and the saints are not idolatrous. Then a large part of that Church is virtually under the dominion of the Czar and must conform to his political ideals. But who can tell when the temporal power of the Czar may cease and a great Church, freed from its political shackles, may be ready to become a leader in the cause of unity?"

"I may be permitted to add," continued Anglic, "that it has been said that our specific plan for unity has failed. It may be so, but has it been useless? Far from it. The proposals which we made have led thousands to study and ponder, and from this study and thought have come the

discussions which, as has been noted, have been without bitterness and in a true spirit of brotherly kindness.

"Our greatest work for unity so far has been, and will be, within our own body. We are learning to appreciate and value the spiritual graces of our Christian brethren of every name. There was a time when was more apparent a juvenile pretentiousness on the part of some of us which found expression in contemptuous references to very sacred things. It comes very near to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to sneer at gifts which are undoubtedly of its bestowing. It is presumptuous to deny the efficacy of sacraments, by whomsoever celebrated in the name of Christ and with the devout purpose of fulfilling His command. It is incomparably more modest, more charitable, more catholic, more Christian, to hold, with one of our leaders of thought that, in such celebrations, the participants do indeed receive every grace for which they pray. In fact, that whole matter lies far beyond our sphere of knowledge, and it lies still further beyond our sphere of lawful judgment. Our duty is to judge ourselves, never to judge others, but rather to thank God for every evidence of His regenerating and sanctifying grace which our separated brethren afford in such rich abundance. Until we can do that we ourselves shall lack the very spirit of unity, and we shall never be ready to be used as one of God's agents in promoting it until we learn that unity is to the full as needful to us as to them. It may be through God's gift that we have something to impart, but I think we are learning that they too have graces without which we cannot be perfected."

"Anglic speaks from the heart," said Method. "He but reflects the growing sentiments of his fellows. Not so many years ago, at a meeting of his general governing body, fraternal greetings, by unanimous vote, were sent to our ruling body, in session at the same time and place,[1] though

[1] Minneapolis, 1895.

a few years before the members of the Anglican body had defeated such a resolution. A venerable member of the Church of Presbus,[1] by authority of that Church, was at that time heard by Anglic's representatives in relation to proposed unity and commanded the most earnest attention. The fact in itself was an unheard-of progression. At the same time and place an earnest Christian lady of the communion of Romanus entertained the entire membership of the Anglican assembly. What were such occurrences but progress? Christianity is not on the decline[2] and with the

[1] The Reverend Joseph Smith.

[2] I have heard it stated that there is an evident decline of Christianity. I am 72 years of age and have been a minister of the Church of England for more than forty-five years.

My own personal recollections go as far back as the year of grace 1850. Then St. Paul's Cathedral, London, had service only in the choir, now you may see thousands in the nave listening to the fervid eloquence of a Scott-Holland or a Sinclair. Then old Trinity, New York, was the embodiment of everything that was slow and dry, for even the *Te Deum* was not sung because it was "Romish." This morning I saw there a well-filled church and heard an earnest sermon.

As a rule I have found the churches of Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists well filled. The Roman Catholic Church is doing a wonderful work among the poor. One Sunday morning I went into a Roman Catholic Church in one of the poorest parts of the city and there was a congregation of a thousand people. I was told that it was the second congregation assembled that morning. I find the sermons in the Roman churches very simple and very Christful. I see no signs of decay anywhere. The student of history knows that religion is always supposed to be on the decline when the Church has rest. It was not on the decline when the Christians were cast into the arena, nor when the martyrs were burnt; but at other times there has been a decay of faith. Things were pretty bad when Bishop Provoost was rector of old Trinity. Read a history of old St. Paul's in London and you will find that the north aisle was a fashionable promenade for the gay women of the town. Read Bishop Butler's *Analogy of Religion* and you will find that in his preface he says "Christianity is no longer regarded but as a matter of ridicule." Read Pepys's *Diary* and you will find that the religious state of England in his day was perfectly appalling.

When you travel on the Continent of Europe you think the state of religion very sad, but compare it with the centuries before, and you will see that matters have greatly improved. In Rome a man of saintly

growth of a true Christianity must come a greater longing for this unity.

"I am convinced more and more, as I consider the matter at greater length and in the backward light, that this unity is bound to come, though it may not be to-morrow, or the day after. It may take many more years to undo than the four hundred it took for the doing. Building up is a slower process than tearing down."

"I was convinced that there had been progress," remarked Anglic, "on a recent visit to a historic churchly edifice, where I heard a message of peace and good will, in the very building in which before some fiery Abbot held forth, or later some bigoted Puritan."

"Though from the latter I am named," observed Puritan. "No matter. We have moved since that time.

"And looking backward, I can report progress in Federation from which, as I have stated, it is my conviction that relief is most promising. I can give two notable instances. One is that a meeting of a Federal Council of the churches of Christ has already been held in America.[1] This conference marks an epoch in the history of practical Christianity in this country, and it has given the Protestant churches a chance to demonstrate that they can sink denominational differences and co-operate upon such live issues as temperance, impurity, race-track gambling, and labour. It has also

---

character occupies the Papal Chair, and the Emperor of Germany is really a devout although warlike Christian. King Edward is exemplary in his religious duties, and President Taft is a confirmed churchgoer.

The views of thinking people have very greatly changed. They no longer believe in the cruel monstrosities of either the Roman purgatory or the Puritan hell, but that does not imply a decay of faith. They formulate their own views of what is called "the inspiration of the Scriptures," but they still regard the Holy Bible as God's book.

Whatever may be said of our modern Christianity the religion of Jesus Christ is not on the decline.—Letter to the New York *Sun*, December, 1909.

[1] In Philadelphia, December, 1908.

convinced the leaders of trade unions that the Church is the friend and not the foe of labour.[1]

"The other instance is the great gathering of the religious forces of the world in the interest of missions,[2] the far-reaching effects of which no one can yet estimate."[3]

[1] The notable results of this Council are thus summarised by William Henry Roberts.

First. There was a manifestation of real unity in the Protestant churches of America. They illustrated that diversity in unity which is the strength not only of the Protestant churches, but also of the American Republic.

Second. The Protestant churches now understand one another better than ever before, and it will be far easier to bring them into co-operative work. There is nothing like knowledge as a basis for action.

Third. The spirit of fraternal fellowship, which has been developing many years, has received a great impetus.

Fourth. The Council has set in motion plans for concerted action by the churches for the moral and spiritual welfare of our country. While no such action will be of a political nature, there will certainly be great progress made in civic reform and other movements.

Fifth. There will be large results in the foreign mission fields. Whatever may be the plans of denominational authorities at home, they must be modified, in view of the spirit of unity which the Council has emphasised and which will have increasing manifestation in foreign lands.

Sixth. Through the Council the churches have once more extended the hand of friendship to the press, both secular and religious. The Council realised the value of the press in work of human welfare, and we look for large results from the co-operative action of the churches and the newspapers.

[2] Edinburgh, 1910.

[3] In October, 1910, the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Triennial session at Cincinnati, Ohio, created a joint commission to suggest and to assist in the calling of a world's conference, to be called a "World's Conference on Faith and Order," to discuss differences and agreements in the various beliefs of all Christian churches for the purpose of promoting Church Unity. This commission, with ample support in sight, organised immediately.

The convention voted to invite this World's Conference on a broad basis, recognising that the propositions of the Lambeth Conference, held in London in 1908, are not generally acceptable to other Christian bodies, principally because that body insisted on the recognition of the

"I would add to my brother's remarks," said Pilgrim, "my opinion that there is a most favourable outlook if we judge by the growing catholicity of the times. This is shown in our international law, our comity of nations, our peace conferences, our arbitrations, our international congresses to secure common standards of time, distance, weight, money, signals, mechanical appliances, a universal alphabet or postage, improved methods of communication, or better prisons. An encouraging sign is that laymen are interested, as shown by the Plain Business Man here witnessing, and have a deep longing for a speedy fulfilment of Christ's promise of unity. In that they are in fact in advance of the mass of their spiritual pastors. The reasons for this may be evident but the condition is for good. A still more encouraging sign is the growing disregard for barriers in our mission fields, all home regulations to the contrary notwithstanding."[1]

Historic Episcopate as essential to Christian unity. The National Congregational Council held in Boston voted at the same time, by singular coincidence, to advance to the very grounds that the Protestant Episcopal Church seemed willing to vacate. The Congregationalists registered their approval of the propositions for Christian unity of the Lambeth Conference, including the requirements for the recognition of the Historic Episcopate, and also voted in favour of reviving the negotiations with the Methodist Protestants and the United Brethren for organic union which were terminated for a time by the refusal of some Congregationalists to agree to a system of advisory district bishops. The deliberations of the Congregationalists were carried on without the knowledge that on that day the Episcopalians were debating the same point.

The proposal of the Cincinnati Convention came before the Baptist World Alliance, held in Philadelphia in July, 1911, and after debate the invitation was accepted.

The Methodists and Disciples of Christ also appointed committees to confer with the other denominations in regard to closer relations and to remedy the evil of overlapping.

[1] A foreign missionary in an appeal to the churches of Europe and America says:

"The Churches which you have planted across the sea have not been won by your words of division. When the Boxers tested the

"Pause a moment, Brethren!"

It was Greatheart who gave the command and who added:

"Why continue? Are you blind? Are you dumb? Is no light breaking upon you as it has upon me?

"I have been listening and thinking. Prompted by the testimony of the Old Man, whom in his infinite wisdom our Moderator had summoned to testify instead of making direct answer to my impudent demand that he conduct this inquiry as we thought would be best rather than as directed by our Divine Master, what have we been led to do? We have been led to call to mind all that has been done and by so doing we have just discovered that it has been done.

"Can it be possible in all these years while we have been praying, yea even while we have been talking here, that our prayers have been and are being answered and we knew it not? Has the good work which we so much desired to further been going on steadily, while we have been trying to

---

Christians in China they did not test them by the Westminster Confession, nor by the Thirty-nine Articles, nor by the Twenty-four, nor by the Sermons of Wesley. Instinctively they chose a more universal and more searching test. Drawing a rude cross upon the ground, they called on their prisoners to trample it under foot, offering life and freedom to those who did so, and death to those who refused. In that hour of terror, some fell from a scarcely grasped faith, but many thousands, men, women, and children, could not bring themselves to put a contemptuous foot on the rudest symbol of the holy passion of their Redeemer, and they died unflinchingly, not as Anglicans, Wesleyans, or Presbyterians, but as Christians, members of the one Body, holding the one faith, inspired by the one Spirit; and so they gained the Crown of Life.

"The testimony of these martyrs, and the voice of the Church which glories in cherishing their memory, have one clear message for us in the Western churches, and it is this: 'It was never your words of division that won us and drew us to the faith and service of Christ. When you speak these words of division your voice is the voice of strangers, and the flock of Christ will neither hear nor follow. But when you speak the word of the Cross you use an irresistible spell. If our divisions have no vital place in your mission to the world, if you cannot commend them to others, why perpetuate them among ourselves?'"

"The world will never be converted by a divided Church."

bring it to pass? And yet we have been almost ready to give up because we did not see results.

"Hereafter, Brethren, let us take a lesson. Let us not set up our own wisdom against that of the Almighty. Let the Master's representative here present be not again criticised, for that is really what we have done, and let us take whatever instruction He may be willing to give us in His own way. Let us pray and work and be content to leave results to God."

CHI

But the Greatest of These

GREATHEART had ceased speaking and all present were expectant in the hope that now the time had arrived when the presiding celestial would confirm his implied promise and, notwithstanding the discovery that in answer to prayer progress had been made, would deliver his especial message and advise directly as to the proper course to pursue.

At length the Moderator did indeed speak, but to a member of the Commission. Said he:

"On you, our beloved Charity, is now laid a duty which no one else can perform. In all this controversy in which these mortals have engaged and in their various retrospects, one thing has been almost entirely neglected. At least it has not been emphasised. It is that one great heavenly attribute, in honour of which you bear your name, which is the one important thing in this connection. You alone can most properly express what we would communicate."

Charity rose and with Peace as his companion quietly moved to a central position in front of the Moderator but facing the assembly. All eyes were upon him and all voices hushed in expectation.

Charity gently began:

"My beloved fellow followers of the Master, there is a tradition in that Master's country from which we come, that shortly after the Master was upon your earth, a fellow Christian of that time, a leader among you, an earnest man, a teacher, was permitted and encouraged to express to you

in his own words, as part of his counsel to certain of his fellows who needed it—and I learn it has been preserved as part of the inspired writings which you have made your rule of life and action—what is one of the foundation doctrines, the foundation rule of action, of that celestial country from which we come. It is in fact the needed medicine, without which the Doctor could not cure the disease, but only describe the symptoms.

"This mortal statement of the immortal dogma, as you have it, reads to the effect, that though you should desire all things to be conferred upon you, good gifts, personal and individual, or collective, as this unity, there is something that you need more, something better, and that something, I say unto you, is the needed thing which will bring about that which you are here more particularly to obtain.

"You may be learned men, as some of you are, so that you can understand all earthly tongues, or even, were it possible, understand the speech of supernaturals, those of our universe, yet if you have not this thing, your learning, which you count as of the first importance, will be of no importance, and your speech will be of no more value than the mechanical sound of clashing metal.

"Or if you have, as some of you have, what you think of next importance, all earthly knowledge, of all seeming mysteries, so that from such knowledge you may predict earthly events, as effects from causes; or if, like some of Christ's faithful followers here, you have such abiding faith that the Master should will to do that which by faith you would bring to pass, and have not this important thing, you are as nothing."

"O Charity," exclaimed Greatheart, "I hear not your words, but a dearly loved formula which is deep in my memory."

A motion from Peace and Greatheart was again silent. Charity continued:

"And there are certain good works which are the attributes of this paramount thing, but if you do them without

this thing as the impelling motive, even if you part with all you have that those poorer than you may be assisted, they amount to nothing. Or even if your abiding faith is of such strength that to prove it you would be willing to suffer torture or death, as some here would will to do, and have not this thing, you gain nothing.

"Would you obtain all Christian graces or would you think so well of your fellows that they and you may live in unity, cultivate this thing, for it, and it alone, will give everything necessary to bring it about; for it brings with it kindness, slowness to anger, and absence of envy, boastfulness, pride, and vanity. It insures becoming behaviour, will not let you take a mean advantage, and prevents passion and evil thoughts. It makes you feel sorrow when evil is done by others, and gladness when good is accomplished. It makes you find excuse for all things apparently wrong in your brother's conduct, to believe all things you may hear to his advantage, to hope that all things may be for his good, and to bear all things with which you may be charged unjustly.

"And to crown all, this important thing never dies, and is therefore more pertaining to our country than to yours. In that it differs from all those other gifts and graces which I have mentioned and which you so much desire, whether they be of speech, knowledge, or prediction. Those gifts are earthly and they will all fade away and be of no account when your mortal life comes to an end. There are three things which are of the immortal country namely, your faith in the Master, your hope of eternal life by and through that faith, and this one thing of which I speak, which is the great thing, greater and more important than both the others, because without it your faith will weaken and from that your hope be lost. It is because it is the great thing, the most important thing, that I, whose business is more particularly to exemplify it, have been sent among you.

"But a more important reason why this thing is greater than all else beside, is because it is the very essence of God

Himself. Therefore cultivate this thing and your prayers are fully answered."

"May we name this important thing which is to govern our actions?" asked Greatheart.

"As the very essence of our Divine Master we count it too sacred for mortal tongues. I myself bear but a substitute. The true word is hidden. That is a short word and for that reason it is easily graven on men's minds if they so desire."

"May we describe its attributes and effects? Let us express our sentiments and see how far they have been affected by your praise of this inimitable thing and how much we may wish to obtain it."

"You may try, Greatheart," said Charity.

"I would offer as an expression of my sentiments an aphorism, a precept, that of Meldinus which you have heard, by observing which we may obtain unity: In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things this most important thing which you have so strongly commended."

"And now let me explain it," continued Greatheart. "As to what are essentials, that involves the question of what is truth. There are but three sources of truth, the evidence of our senses, mathematical demonstration, and the Word of God. The first is liable to deceive, mathematical demonstration never converted a man, and human interpretation of Scripture may err.

"In the effort to define truth I might give an example. To deny that the Eighth Henry ever lived, a question of fact, would be a betrayal of the truth. To question whether he was a good or bad man, would be a matter of opinion, largely of comparison, and would be debatable. There is so much that is matter of opinion, and so much that may have extenuating circumstances, that we should be careful how we judge the actions of others. We must consider intention. We must accept such an excuse as a child gives when he says, 'I did not go to do it.' We must recognise that truth is many sided and must be so, though many of us stand gazing at but one of its phases. We must recognise

differences in religious beliefs, even as God has made and recognised differences in nature. It is the law of the universe, in both the organic and inorganic world. No two blades of grass, no two drops of water, no two birds or beasts, no two countenances of men, no two tastes, no two worlds are exactly alike.[1] We tolerate these differences and even count them valuable until we come to religion, then we not only regret them, but cannot abide them. But it is the mingling of sincere convictions that enables us to correct fallacies and rectify blunders. I approve the inclusiveness of Anglic. Even Romanus, intolerant of others as he is generally regarded, tolerates in one communion his various ecclesiastical societies and in them recognises differences which are as great as between different sects of Protestants. So much for essentials.

"As for liberty in non-essentials, we must remember that liberty is not license. We hear every day numbers of foolish people speaking about liberty, as if it were such an honourable thing. So far from being that, it is, on the whole, and in the broadest sense, dishonourable, and an attribute of the lowest creatures. Throughout the world, of the two abstract things, liberty and restraint, restraint is always the more honourable.[2] So much for liberty.

"As to that important thing which is to govern all other things, though I may not name it, I, and I think all here, know what it is, can appreciate it, and be governed by it.

[1] What is the chief charm and glory of a holiday beyond the seas to the jaded worker; or even of a graphically written, vividly illustrated book of travel to the mentally exhausted toiler? Is it not the change of occupation, landscape, climate, people, customs, history, tradition, religion, political ideas, everything almost, which environs him in the foreign land? It is something as *The Spectator* forcibly if not elegantly remarks, "if you only have the gutters in a different place!"

What was the most prominent feature of the great coronation gathering in London in 1902? Was it not the marvellous variety of races, representing the equally diverse lands and climes of the vast Empire which has been entrusted to our stewardship?—*Frank Spence.*

[2] Ruskin.

When we are so governed we will not tolerate ignorance of our fellow men, for nearly all our religious misunderstandings and antipathies arise from the fact that we do not know each other well enough. Ignorance of each other's opinions and want of appreciation of each other's motives have often led us to impute false ideas and extravagant notions to each other, while a better knowledge would have united us in a common brotherhood.

"Under the guidance of this thing, it will not be necessary to give up anything, but retain everything of value, that every one may have the benefit of all that is good. We shall look only at the good and not notice the bad. We shall not even mention subjects on which we are now supposed to be irrevocably opposed. Our speech will be mildness itself, but it will have more effect than all our previous disdainful sharpness of wit.

"With such help even Church unity may become possible among Christians. With such help we can become again as a little child, with childlike faith who is content not to inquire too far, is satisfied in the faith of his fathers and is willing that others should be also. This childlike faith will not come from intellect. We shall simply believe the Master's word as unquestionably and implicitly as we did that of our mother in infancy. This important thing alone will give a bond of unity such as membership in the same branch of the Christian Church cannot give, for a Christian at times has been found hating even his own brother. A brother who differs has been counted a greater enemy than a stranger, or one not of the Christian faith. Greater credit has at times been given to the virtues of Parsees, Confucians, Buddhists, Mohammedans, or Socinians than to those of one of our own household whose opinions are not as ours.

"If we follow the directions of such a guide, even the distinctive lines between Roman Catholic and Protestant will fade away or at least be counted as of no moment.

"Such guidance will make us appreciate the fact that a

sect, even the purest, noblest, and grandest, stands for a certain lordliness and exclusiveness, in that it separates its members from others whom it does not deny are believers in Christ. We will have to admit that no sect was ever made by the Master.

"When we submit to such guidance, we shall be so busy, each with his own appointed work, that we shall not have the time to hold meetings to bring about unity, nor would they be necessary; nor yet would our work clash, for we would wish others to do all they possibly could and have all that rightfully belongs to them.

"There is plenty of work to do right here among the needy in body or soul, even if we let the heathen go for a time or refer them to Zealot and his friends. There is so much physical suffering in the world, so large a section of humanity that requires upliftment, so many of our own Christians to Christianise, that we might even omit the Jew from our present activities, whom we now look on as an unregenerate or very savage. After we have carried the Gospel to the unregenerate of our own faith, when we have turned the criminal from evil doing, when we have lifted the heavy hand of oppression from all who suffer, then we may try to persuade the Jew from the faith of his fathers, which has always been more liberal than ours, in that it has always agreed that the righteous of all peoples have a share in the good world to come.

"We should labour to do away with the obstacles. We need not, however, all try to work at them from the same side, but with but one object, to demolish them, some by the hydraulic method, some with picks, some with shovels, some with bare hands if too poor to buy tools, and it is not necessary to tell them to stop work until tools are provided. When we so work there will be a real union. It will be from below upward, by a real fellowship among the workers, because we will have grown toward each other, not by treaty between the high contracting parties; and then it will be easy enough to arrange the details. Then we may again

merit the commendation which an old heathen bestowed upon the early Christians: 'See how these Christians are devoted to one another.' "

"I wish to give you my sentiment voluntarily, good Charity," said Bapto. Not being prevented, he continued:

"Our barriers are not of iron but of ice, which will melt away under the sun of such a Christian regard as Greatheart has been describing. There are so many people in the various portions of the Christian Church that have characters so worthy of imitation, that we want to think as they do. Such people cannot be all wrong. The more such people there are, the more people there will be who will wish to copy them. Who would wish to erase from the history of Christianity the story of the Waldenses, the Lutherans, the Puritans, the Anglicans, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Moravians, the Jansenists, or the Quakers? Who would wish to erase the story of countless thousands among the Roman Catholics? Each is a facet in God's great diamond of truth, flashing prismatic hues, the union of which makes the white light. It is not given to any man, however great, or to any one set of men, to comprehend all truth; for, if it were, men would be infinite."[1]

"Am I under orders not to speak?" said Militant. "If not I would say that in my opinion, as we are organised, unity can never be brought about by hard fighting but by this needed thing. With that we may defy the devil to keep us apart. Our divisions leave him master of the field, particularly when we attack each other, often through nothing more than sheer jealousy, which has turned many a victory into a defeat. We should keep our own lines, they are but a part of the whole army, but when united effort is needed we can spring at once into the great line of battle and fight together. If by misunderstanding, in the hurry, you should miss your particular place, fall in somewhere, no

[1] G. D. Boardman.

matter where, so that it is on the right side. Then you have the commission to fight, for there is no warrant like that given by this thing of which Charity has spoken. It is pitiful when God's children fight through greed and envy, but it is heartsome when they are willing to wrestle about the Gospel, for surely the end of it all must be peace."[1]

"And I would give a sentiment, if I may," said Zealot. "I work among my heathens and I am directed to sing to them indiscriminately to the effect that they are vile and idolatrous, though many of them are of such a nature and of such belief that they are neither. At the same time we tell them that our souls are enlightened with wisdom from on high. This appears pharisaical, looks like self-conceit, and can only give offence to those I wish to reach. It does not help me in my work in the least. Under such circumstances when I speak of this incomparable thing, I am accused of haughtiness and pride. If these heathens, many of them intelligent and deeply religious in their way, were to turn about and send messengers to us who would express such sentiments, we should not like it.

"But under the guidance of this Divine attribute we shall do these things no longer, nor shall we unnecessarily offend these pagans by showing a contempt for their persons, their religion, their morals, their nationality; nor require of them a surrender of habits and customs which they cannot give up without cutting themselves loose from their traditions, which necessarily and naturally have become most sacred to them. We shall no longer be required to inform them that their ancestors are necessarily in hell because they have believed not as we do, on hearing which one heathen man under my ministrations withdrew from the baptismal font, preferring eternal damnation with his fathers to the bliss of the Christian heaven in the company of Christian saints and martyrs. When we so act my work will be carried on to better advantage, for it will be raised to a higher level."

[1] After Ian Maclaren. His Mother's Sermon.

"And I claim a right to give a sentiment," said Baptizo, and he proceeded:

"I ask not by which name, among the rest
That Christians go by, he is named or known;
Whether his faith has ever been 'professed,'
Or whether proven by his deeds alone,
So there be Christhood in him, all is well;
He is my brother, and in peace we dwell."

"And I a sentiment," said Pilgrim, without waiting for permission:

"Right is not of one party
Nor truth of a single creed."

"And I may be heard," said Radic. "My grudge has been against Anglic and particularly against Earnest with his lamps and candles. But I now believe, through the influence of this thing, that even he has got beyond his own lines of demarcation, though he still cleaves to the things he likes; so far beyond, that he can again appreciate me and mine as followers of the Master. In return I can even appreciate the goodness in his freaks and unfledged clergy with their monotonous readings, and can think that they do as they do because they believe it to be right."

"To that it is my wish to add," said Earnest, "that my sentiments reciprocate those of Radic, for whom I have sincere respect. I do not think that want of uniformity is equivalent to schism, much less that schismatics are always sinners. I wish for communion and spiritual fellowship with all, though this does not imply that I do not have my preference, for I do not hesitate to declare that I know of no organisation calling itself a church to compare with my own. While conceding, however, to the uttermost all the advantages to be derived from the fact that our Church has come down in a continuous stream from the fountain-head,

it is nevertheless true that no individual soul needs to wander back eighteen centuries to feel the thrilling touch, the close guidance, the all-surrounding care of the Personal Lord. If I refuse to recognise this fact, and regard many of Christ's own as outside the pale of His Church because they walk not with us, then I should feel that it is I, and not they, who am guilty of the sin of schism.[1] I hereby affirm that my Church authorises no man on earth to use one syllable of accusation or offence against any body of non-episcopal Christians."

"I would not be behind my brother Earnest," said Anglic. "His sentiments show how little a spiritually minded man of large experience, strict churchman of our communion as he confessedly is, and immovable in his personal attachment to our historic order, depends upon the most convincing proofs of Apostolic Succession for the furtherance of unity.[2] I share his feeling deeply and sincerely. Of the fact of Apostolic succession in the Christian ministry, I have no more doubt than I have of the continuity of Apostolic faith in the Christian Church; or to put it more concretely, I have no more doubt of the orders of my brother Earnest than I have of the legitimacy of the title of the present King of England, and yet I neither presume to deny the grace of God which manifestly attends the ministration of non-episcopal divines, nor do I expect them to be induced to accept episcopacy by the force of controversial argument. The spirit of unity must come before the fact of unity, and that which gives me most joy in my brother's words is the spirit of unity which they express, and which I trust is spreading and deepening in our Church.

"I have in mind at the present time two noble men, both men of God and ministers of Christ. One is a pastor of long experience and great piety, not of my faith, who cares for a worthy congregation of Christ's believers. The other,

[1] After Charles William Stubbs, Bishop of Truro.

[2] Said of Bishop William Croswell Doane.

who is neighbour to the first, is as noble a man and labours in our particular field. Now when at last, in the Father's house, these two men stand before the Master they have served, with the ingathered fruits of their labours, a goodly company of those who have been rescued from sin and death, the Lord of the harvest surely will not fail to bestow alike upon each the gracious approval, 'well done.' Nor is it conceivable that there, when eyes and hearts shall have been fully open, they will not rejoice together over what they have been able to accomplish, and each with humility acknowledge the other to have been a divinely accredited minister of the Gospel, of the grace of God.

"Our Church does not only pray 'from false doctrine, heresy, and schism, good Lord deliver us,' but also with all sincerity that other petition that the good Lord will deliver us from pride, vain-glory and all uncharitableness. It may well be doubted whether the sin of schism is that of which our Church is now in greatest peril. Its future safety depends more on the cultivation of this greatest of all Christian graces of which we have been reminded."

"And I would also give a sentiment," said Method.

"Pardon the interruption, Method. This is urgent." It was the Plain Business Man who spoke. He had looked beyond Charity to where the Moderator sat, and had noticed certain preparations as if for departure. "Will you not, Sire, if it is your intention to leave us, first give us your personal advice, your line of directions, what we are to do. Do not leave us with this business unfinished. Give us something definite. We admit that we have become conscious that much has already been done which we did not appreciate before. But you will forgive me if I press for more now, for we may never see you again."

The Moderator did not reply but Charity spoke for him.

"I have been informed that our leader's orders were only to report. He will do so and it will be for your advantage."

"But we want to know more."

"What more is needed?" asked Charity. "You have

been told what is the essential thing. Cultivate it. Nourish it. That is the key which will open every lock so that you may go unimpeded, as you would."

"But you have not even given us the word," continued the Plain Business Man. "You have only described it. We may guess at it but we want it in black and white."

"It is too sacred to speak or even write unadvisedly," said Charity.

"How then shall we come to a knowledge of it?" asked the Business Man.

"May we whisper it?" asked Greatheart.

"Yes, Greatheart," answered Charity.

"It is a single word?"

"Yes, Greatheart."

"And in four letters?"

"Yes, Greatheart. In your tongue."

"Shall we letter it?"

"Yes, Greatheart."

"I knew it," shouted Method. "That settles it. The problem is solved. Let me give my sentiment."

"Yet a moment, Method," again interrupted the Plain Business Man. "We may never have another chance. It is for your benefit as well as mine. If, as you say, you know the word, let that go for the present. I want to ask many things. Will these here present come again? I want to know as to this unknown country. Shall we know each other there? How can we be sure that we shall get there? There are a million questions that I would ask of you Charity."

"We are of the opinion, Charity," said the Moderator at length, "that you have not finished that which you were delegated to say. You have been over lenient with your interrupters. Continue."

Thus commanded, Charity again began:

"It is not best for you my fellow Christians, as has already been pointed out, that you, with your mortal natures, should know all these things now. Now you know

in part and you can prophesy only in part, for human knowledge and prophecy are both alike incomplete. But when you have reached another existence in which all things are perfect, then all the things which are imperfect, including all this imperfect knowledge which you wish to overcome, will be done away. That change will be like passing from childhood to maturity. You will no longer speak as a child, as you now do, or understand as a child, or think as a child. You are now seeing things of our world as in an imperfect mirror, darkly. You get but glimpses and only within narrow limits. You can have but partial revelation. But when you are face to face with the Master, you will know even as you are known. To you now the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal."

Charity pausing as if he had finished, Method again urged that he be permitted to give his sentiment. Not being hindered he began:

"For over this Church's portal,
Each Pillar and Arch above,
The Master has set His signet,
And graven His watchword——"

The sentiment was not concluded. There was confusion in the vast assembly. In trying to ascertain the cause Method glanced toward the Moderator and noted that his place was empty. The presiding officer had departed and the sittings were over.

PSI

Eye hath not Seen, nor Ear Heard, the Things which God hath Prepared

AND here I, the mortal writer of these pages, bear witness to the further things which came to pass upon this earth in connection with these celestial visitors.

While Method was speaking I had received a summons, not in words, but as unmistakable as it was irresistible, to follow the Moderator who withdrew, together with the other members of the Commission. The party consisted as before of its presiding head, with Charity, Peace, and the two recording angels. I noticed that the Old Man who had been a witness followed them closely. He did so willingly and confidently as if by command, and with a great joy showing in his countenance. He passed near me and I asked why he thus followed.

"The Master has called me," said he. "I go as they go."

We were without, and around us were gathering many from the assembly, all sorrowful, for it was now fully evident that these kindly visitors were to remain no longer. He, who had presided as the Moderator during the sessions, was in the act of giving his directions for the journey when a heavenly messenger came among us. My recollection is indistinct, but I feel convinced that this being was the same who had first called me to the Master's service.

Of this wondrous being our leader asked:

"You have a message for us?"

"Yes, Sire," was the reply.

"Take it Charity and read, and aloud," was the command. Charity did so. Thus it read:

"To all my faithful people, this greeting:

"Now the Lord of Peace Himself give you Peace always by all means.

"Peace I leave with you.

"My Peace I give unto you.

"Not as the world giveth, give I unto you."

As the reading was concluded the leader remarked:

"You then, Peace, are to remain. We go."

"An inestimable gift," said the Old Man.

Immediately the celestial visitors departed and were carried up into the heavens and with them went the aged one. I alone was allowed to remain for a few moments, possibly for a reason, that I might witness what followed.

Standing by Peace I observed the bewildered multitude. At first they watched those departing. Then they became conscious that one celestial, Peace, remained. As they became assured of this they gathered around, showing the greatest joy, some in their joyfulness kneeling and worshipping as if before a God, others assured themselves that the sight was not a vision by touching the celestial's garments and even by kissing them.

"And you are to remain?" said Greatheart, who had forced his way to the front rank. He had followed, and as nearly as the throng would permit, as soon as he had seen the leader depart from the assembly; and after him had come all who had taken a prominent part in the proceedings, and many others, more than could get near the spot where we were gathered.

"Yes, friend Greatheart," replied Peace "It is the Master's will. I remain until you drive me away. That is not difficult however if you so desire."

"God forbid," said Greatheart.

Immediately there was great pressure from all around to get near, to see, to hear, to speak to the one who had thus been left as a legacy from those who had been with us. The

women were particularly pressing. One whose clothing was of the darkest hue, indicating by that outward token a great bereavement, succeeded in reaching the visitor and spoke to him:

"Will you tell me, dear Peace, of the hereafter? Are those I love there, and are they happy?"

Another woman pressing forward asked:

"Is there a torture? Mine was a good boy at heart, but wild."

Another asked, "Shall I meet my loved ones, my children? Shall I know them?"

Still another asked, "Is my father safe? Shall I meet him?"

"And my husband?" asked another.

"And my baby? Where is he? He was not baptised," was the query of another.

To all these Peace, with kindly face and listening attentively, did not for a time reply. Then he motioned for quietness and said:

"I will give you the Master's message. 'I will not leave you comfortless. I will come to you. And I will pray the Father and He shall give you another Comforter. Ye shall be sorrowful but your sorrow shall be turned into joy. Sorrow and sighing shall flee away.' And you shall see His face."

"Will they come again?" asked another. "They who have just gone?"

Peace replied:

"In the Master's good time. Wait. Again the Master's message. 'And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch,' and for the Master Himself, for the message further says 'Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me.' "

"Shall we live again?" anxiously inquired another. "I know we shall but I want you to say so. It would be such a comfort."

"Again the Master's message, 'Because I live, ye shall live also.' "

"I want assurance," said another, "as more important than all else, that my sins are forgiven, so that I may inherit the Kingdom."

"Again the divine message," said Peace. " 'Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow.' "

"But how shall I avoid them in future?" persisted the inquirer, and Peace again replied:

" 'In all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy paths. He that overcometh shall inherit all things.' "

"But I am weary, how can I overcome?"

"Again a message," said Peace. " 'They may rest from their labours and their works do follow them.' "

"But I would know how,—when. O Peace, tell me."

"Would you be any better, Mortal, for knowing?" was the reply.

At this point I was no longer permitted to listen. An irresistible impulse compelled me and I was caught up as they had been and was again with the celestial party on their return journey through space.

As we started, a new thing of interest attracted my attention, which, as we neared it, proved to be nothing less than a great river composed entirely of human beings, all travelling and in one direction, which was the same as that we travelled.

Turning to Charity, in the absence of Peace, who had been my kindly instructor on the inward journey, I asked:

"What may these be? Whither go they and why?"

"These are they," replied Charity, "whom the Master has called. They go up continually day and night and while the world endures."[1]

[1] There is a country into which there is to-day a yearly immigration with which no other country in any age has had anything to compare. Every year thirty-five millions of people, or one-half the population of these United States, enter its ports and crowd its fields as new-comers and colonists. Every month there are three millions, every day, while we sleep and rise, one hundred thousand. Of these, one-third are nominal Christians, two-thirds are heathen. These immigrants come from every land, every climate, every tongue. They are of every age and

"And why saw I not these as we came to earth?"

"You were otherwise occupied and absorbed, in things which you had not seen before, things of greater moment, so that you could notice naught else."

As we journeyed, I watched this strange procession. At times, among the countless numbers, I recognised those whom I had known or knew of on earth. At times some wandered from the throng and joined our party, which thus became enlarged in numbers. Some of these remained with us, but others seemed not to find congenial company and withdrew of their own choice. Among these latter I noticed some who had been of the best reputation in the world, while among those who remained were many lowly people of whom I had never heard. As I tried to distinguish the characteristics, by reason of which some came with us, as if by right, and others were left behind, it gradually became apparent to me that here, with these heavenly representatives, human credentials were of little moment, whether as a Romanist, a Protestant, a strict observer of ritual, a member of an historic church, or of any sect, they all were of little value to those who were about to be examined by a trial of their hearts.

Again I appealed to Charity for information:

"Why is it that we are thus kept in ignorance while we are on earth as to which is the proper way in which to walk? Why are we not told which is the proper church, the proper doctrine, the proper dogma, as to what is right, what is

---

station and condition,—princes and peasants, young men and maidens, old men and children. It was to this marvellous country that an Indian officer referred, when, after describing his skirmishes, battles, sieges, personal encounters, hair-breadth escapes, outbreaks of mutiny, reverses and victories, he paused with the observation, "I expect to see something much more remarkable than anything I have been describing." As he was seventy years of age, and was understood to have retired from active service, his listeners failed to catch his meaning. There was a pause, and then he said, in an undertone, "I mean in the first five minutes after death."—Walker Gwynne, *Some Purposes of Paradise.* New York, Edwin S. Gorham.

truth, the one thing on which we may all agree? It would save so much doubt and trouble and more men would be saved."

Charity turned to me reprovingly.

"Mortal, we have but one law of obedience in our country, as you should know. It is the Master's will. That is enough. We are content. We ask not why."

From this point there is a blank in my recollections. I must have become as though unconscious. When my human consciousness returned, I was sitting in my study as I had been when first called, but with the pile of manuscript before me, containing a portion of this record, which I have since amplified and corrected as my memory served me, until it has become what is here set forth.

OMEGA

The Prayers of David the Son of Jesse are Ended

SO said the Psalmist and so he taught, but were they? He may have ceased asking, but the prayers were not ended while they were in progress toward that far country in which liveth Majesty, nor while the gracious answers were in process of return.

One fixed opinion I have gathered through these proceedings. It is that whatever may be the status of unity throughout the Church militant of earth, it has an immense and a growing clientage among the glorious throngs of the Church triumphant in Heaven.

But there is one thing I had almost forgotten.

As I recollect the occurrence, it must have been just before I left the celestial party to continue its homeward way and I, the mortal, returned to my earthly abode—probably just before Charity had rebuked me for trying to pry into secrets which did not concern me with his unanswerable formula: "It is the Master's will. That is enough. We are content"—that he had put into my hand a paper which he informed me was the prescription the Doctor had written at the close of his testimony and which the Moderator had ordered into his temporary custody. He gave it to me with this injunction:

"On earth read and make it public. It was so ordered."

Now that my task is otherwise finished, I have recalled this command and hasten to do as directed. The Prescription reads as follows:

"Of May (not Must) a great deal.

Of Moderation (not Excess) the proper amount.

Of Inclusiveness (not Exclusiveness) a sufficient quantity.

Of Love (of first purity, if you are so fortunate as to find it) more than all combined.

Apply personally, in these proper proportions, and gradually."

APPENDIX I

The Extent of the Universe

THE extent of the universe is not easily appreciable by mortal minds. Put into figures it means nothing. Ten quadrillions on paper means to the mind no more than a million and without means of comparison even that cannot be grasped. The human mind must have something tangible by which to judge.

Our ordinary models and diagrams of the heavenly bodies, even of our own solar system, are misleading because in such models and diagrams, if practicable for ordinary use, we cannot combine relative sizes and distances though each can be shown separately. Thus, to compare the orbit of Neptune with the diameter of the earth, we should have to represent the former by a circle 550 feet in diameter, while the diameter of the earth would have to be represented by a globule less than $\frac{1}{100}$ of an inch in size. To compare the earth and its moon on a scale of relative size, we should use a marble of one half-inch diameter to represent the earth which has a diameter of 8000 miles and a bead of $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch diameter to represent the moon. To compare those relative sizes with the relative distances we should have to place the half-inch marble and the one-eighth-inch bead at a distance of fifteen inches from each other. But to combine these two with something which will also show relatively the size and distance of the sun, we must use a ball four and one half feet (fifty-four inches) in diameter to represent the sun, against the half-inch marble and one eighth of an

inch bead, and put a distance of 495 feet (5940 inches) between the representatives of the sun and the earth. To appreciate the difference in sizes, conceive if you can the fifty millions of moons, whatever that may mean to your mind, which are necessary to make up the bulk of the sun. Place that many moons in line and they would reach around the orbit of our outer planet Neptune. It would take five hundred earths to make up the bulk of the sun. To try to realise that, think that the largest vista the human eye can possibly take in at one time on the earth's surface is but one millionth part of that surface, and that the whole of that surface—a million times what one can ever see from the highest point attainable—is but one earth of which it would take five hundred to make the bulk of the sun, while the sun itself is but one out of known millions of such bodies.

As to the ordinary methods of comparison by the speed of railway trains, cannon-balls, and light, they may be summarised thus:

Take our smallest celestial distance, that from the earth to the moon. A cannon-ball at a speed of one thousand miles an hour would require ten days in which to reach the moon. Calculate for yourself how much slower a railway train would be at the high speed of fifty miles an hour.

Now compare this moon distance with that from the earth to the sun and at once the figures representing the time required by railway trains and cannon-balls become unmanageable and more so when we come to fixed stars. A cannon-ball from the earth to the nearest fixed star would take five millions of years to reach it. Something inconceivably faster such as the speed of light is then necessary as a measure. This speed, taking eight minutes to travel from the earth to the sun, may become a million years between fixed stars.

The stars which we see belong to nebulæ, the most of them to the nebula of which our sun is a part and the distant edges of which as it stretches away into space forms to our

eyes our Milky Way. Some indistinct distant point of light is all we see of some other nebula of like proportions.

Let us try to count up the worlds represented.

The unaided eye in the northern hemisphere, the night being clear, sees but about one thousand stars discernible as such. The Milky Way is not resolvable into stars to the naked eye. It contains say 20,191,000 suns, each probably surrounded by, on an average, about fifty planets, a total 1,000,955,000 stars—a thousand million and but the northern half of our visible universe. By the telescope we know of at least 3000 milky ways like ours to say nothing of unknown ones. This would make a total of 6,000,000,000,000 worlds, finished, unfinished, or done for, which if they could pass before us at the rate of one a second would take for the passage 190,260 years.

SIR JOHN HERSCHEL'S METHOD

Sir John Herschel's method of showing the relative sizes and distances of the members of the solar system was as follows:

Choose any well-levelled field. On it place a globe two feet in diameter to represent the sun; Mercury will be represented by a grain of mustard seed, on the circumference of a circle 164 feet in diameter for its orbit; Venus a pea, on a circle of 284 feet in diameter; the Earth a (somewhat larger) pea, on a circle of 430 feet; Mars, a rather large pin's head, on a circle of 654 feet; the asteroids, grains of sand, in orbits of from 1000 to 1200 feet; Jupiter a moderate sized orange, on a circle of half a mile; Saturn a small orange, on a circle of four-fifths of a mile; Uranus, a full sized cherry, on a circle more than one and a half miles; Neptune an extra sized cherry, on a circle of two and a half miles in diameter.

It is needless to say that Sir John's method for actual visible demonstration is impracticable.

MORE EXACT FIGURES

The eight planets that form our solar system are: Mercury, distance from the sun, 35,000,000 miles; diameter 3000 miles; revolution around the sun, 88 days. Venus, distance 65,000,000 miles; diameter 7600 miles; revolution, 225 days. The Earth, distance, 92,500,000 miles; diameter, 7918; revolution 365.26 days. Mars, distance, 141,000,000 miles; diameter 4211 miles; revolution 687 days. Jupiter, distance, 481,000,000 miles; diameter 86,000 miles; revolution, 11.86 years. Saturn, distance, 882,000,000 miles; diameter 70,500 miles; revolution 29.46 years. Uranus, distance, 1,744,000,000 miles; diameter, 31,700 miles; revolution 84 years. Neptune, distance 2,780,000,000 miles; diameter, 34,500 miles; revolution 165 years.

The sun is 865,000 miles in diameter. The moon is about 2200 miles in diameter and is distant from the earth about 240,000 miles.

APPENDIX II

The Beginning of Early English Christianity

WHEN our Lord was born, England and Wales were occupied by two separate peoples, the Gaels, near Wales and Cornwall, and the Britons, the latter by no means barbarous, having a religion with a priesthood and an elaborate ritual. Julius Cæsar, in 55 A.D., failed in his effort to conquer Britain, and again failed in the following year. One hundred years later Britain was conquered and became a Roman province, during what might be called the Apostolic era. Rome put down Druidism, a menace to Roman supremacy, but put nothing in its place. Christian soldiers with the Roman armies helped to introduce a knowledge of Christ, but without much result until the end of the second century when a profound impression was made upon both Celts and Britains, but the Church order among the Celts differed from that among the early British Christians. Britains by the end of the third century had begun to surrender themselves to the religious influence of their conquerors, as they learned their language and assimilated their manners. By the fourth century there were British scholars like Pelagius capable of taking part in the theological controversies of the time. He was a thinker and a scholar. Certain of his original views were condemned as heretical. A deputation of bishops of the Galican Church was sent over to confer with the British bishops who sided with Pelagius, and the British bishops

seemed unwilling to surrender their views. It is clear that by the early part of the fifth century Britain was a Christian land and the Church occupied a recognised position in Western Christendom.

In 409 A.D. the Roman power in Britain waned and the legions were withdrawn. Without them the Romanised Britains could not prevent the incursions of the Teutons, the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles, which pushed the Britains westward until, when the sixth century was coming to an end, the whole east country was in subjection to the new conquerors. These conquerors were heathen. The Britains took refuge with the Gaels of the west, and the Gaelic and British churches were somewhat drawn together by suffering. They did not strive to convert the English folk. The British Church was losing touch with Christian communities on the Continent, and was tending to become an isolated body and narrowly exclusive. But a Scotic Church had been growing up in Ireland, so called because the inhabitants were then called Scots or Scoti. In the fifth century came Saint Patrick, a Britain, born in 389 A.D., near the mouth of the Severn. As a boy he was carried to Ireland as a slave, where he remained six years. Then he escaped and returned home. He came back as a Christian missionary, planted the Gospel in Ireland, and died 461 A.D. From the Church which he planted in Ireland came two missionaries. One, Columban, born in Leicester in 543 A.D., tried to improve professing Christians and reform monastic life. In 588 A.D. he crossed to Frankland (France) where his work was greatly blessed, and he died in 615 A.D. The other, Columba (or Columcille), was born in Ulster, 521 A.D. Previous to his birth a Britain named Ninian, a pupil of Martin of Tours, had tried, in 395, to convert the heathen Picts of Galloway. He spread the Christian faith as far as the Grampions, but the work did not last.

Some Irish Scots had settled in what is now Argyleshire, and they and the Picts to the east and north of them appear to have been heathen. Columba, to work among these,

left Ireland in 563 and, with twelve companions, took up his abode in the Island of Iona on the coast of Mull which from that time became the centre of missionary activity and the home of generations of holy men, through whose labours the propagation of the Gospel was effectively carried on. This centre furnished many zealous missionary bishops.

Among the companions of Columba in his island home, two are named who were not Britains or Scots, but of the Saxon people, the fierce invaders with whom the British Church would have nothing to do. These "Saxons" were the first fruits of the English folk gathered into the garner of the Lord.

The King of Kent, one of the Saxon kingdoms, married a Christian wife in France who brought with her a chaplain to St. Martin's Church in Canterbury but the British Church was holding out no hand to evangelise the heathen people.

A year or two before the great Gregory was elected Bishop of Rome, in 590 A.D. as Gregory I., he was in the slave market at Rome where he was attracted by the beauty of some fair-haired boys exposed for sale. "Of what nation are these?" he asked. "Angles, heathen Angles," was the reply. "Nay angels might they be, were they only Christians."

From that hour his dearest wish was to send a special missionary for the conversion of the English folk, and a Roman monk Augustine, with a large party of helpers, arrived in Kent in 597. Augustine became a territorial bishop, later Archbishop of the English folk with his See at Canterbury, and as such, on the receipt of letters from Gregory in 601, he invited the British bishops to a conference to try to secure joint action for evangelising the heathen English. The English bishops would have none of him. At this conference one of the subjects of heated dispute was the time for keeping Easter, which the British and Scotic churches kept upon a different day from the Christians on the Continent of Europe. Augustine returned

to Canterbury and spent all his energies in making that the centre of Christian life, and in providing for a permanent organisation.

The Scotic Christians had begun their splendid missionary activity but there was no harmony between them and the smaller Christian body organised by Augustine. But another conference was held at which the long standing dispute as to Easter was settled, and the church of England began to be an organised unit. In the missionary activity those trained in the Scotic schools, both of Columba at Iona and of Columban in France, were prominent.

Compiled from "The Beginnings of English Christianity," and "The Beginnings of the English Church," in *Penny History of the Church of England*, by Augustus Jessopp. London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

APPENDIX III

The Early Anglican Church

WHEN Augustine, the Italian monk and missionary, sent out by Gregory the Great to convert the Angles of Britain, reached the sphere of his mission in 597, he found in hiding there a regularly organised Christian church, with its own distinctive characteristics and its own peculiar rites and ceremonies.

In the year 1215, the three estates of the realm of England drew up at Runnymede, in defiance of the base betrayal of their liberties by the king, the Magna Charta, the first article of which reads, "The Church of England shall be free, and her rights and liberties respected."

Three hundred years after, the English Parliament, following up the petition of convocation to the king, passed an act in 1533, declaring that "the Crown of England was imperial, and the nation a complete body in itself, with full power to give to all manner of folk justice in all cases, spiritual as well as temporal, without restraint or appeal to any foreign power or potentate; the body spiritual having power when any cause of the law divine happened to come into question to declare and interpret by that part of the body politic called the spiritual, now being usually called the English Church . . . all doubts without the intermeddling of any exterior power."

The Church which Augustine found in hiding through the violence of its enemies was a Church which had already vindicated its claim to catholicity by the part which it had

taken at the Council of Arles, in 314, against the schism of the Donatists; and had received imperial recognition at the Council of Ariminum in 359, where British bishops were present.

When, in the year 603, Augustine first came into direct personal contact with the British Church, he found it differing from the Roman Church in its time for observing the Easter festival, in its mode of administering the rite of baptism, in its form of tonsure, and in consecrating to the Episcopate by one bishop only. These points of difference were, without exception, questions of rites and ceremonies only.

It is manifest that no one of these points of difference between the Roman and the British and Scoto-Celtic churches was in itself of sufficient importance to be regarded as a ground of separation. While it is true that in order to insure the integrity of the succession, the canon of the Council of Nice requires three consecrators, it is equally true that the validity of the rite depends not upon the number of consecrators, but upon the fact that the grace conferred shall be conveyed through the channel of a successor of the Apostles. The real question at issue was the right to differ in things, not essential, as claimed by the Churches of Asia Minor in the Apostolic Age upon the one side, and the claim to absolute authority and conformity on the other. This [latter] the Church of England has always refused to acknowledge, as opposed to the practice and teaching of the Apostolic Age, and at variance with the liberty which Christ Himself bestowed upon the Church, when, in view of the exigencies of the future, He neither established a form of polity, nor provided for an unvarying ritual. . . .

Nor was it by accident we may believe that Theodore of Tarsus (Canterbury, A.D. 668–690), educated under the influence of the same Greek schools which made Saint Paul the chosen Apostle of the Gentiles, was the man selected for the work of fusing a mere collection of missions among

a few scattered tribes into a national [English] church, under one head; and united together by the points and bands of a properly arranged system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It was the Church of England which first laid the foundations of national unity. What Augustine failed to do, Theodore accomplished; and he accomplished it without any compromise of principle, either on the one side or the other. When Wilfred of York refused to consent to the division of his vast diocese, and made the new condition of things a ground of excuse for an appeal to Rome, Theodore refused to obey the summons to leave the country and attend a Council at Constantinople. He set at naught the anathema against any one who should resist the decree for the reinstating of Wilfred. As Theodore refused to acknowledge the undue influence of authority from without, so also he sought to harmonise into one the conflicting elements within. He took occasion to unite together the Roman and the British lines of succession, by making the saintly Chad Bishop of Lichfield as a reward for his meekness, in not turning his previous ordination into a bone of contention; and accepting the more canonical ordination of the Nicene canon, to make surety more sure. The ground taken by Theodore in the matter was sustained by the Council of Clovesham in 747, which, when Cuthbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, proposed to refer difficult questions to the Bishop of Rome, refused to compromise the dignity of their church, and declared the Archbishop of Canterbury to be its supreme head. The action of the Council was one which had already been taken by the North African Church, and the churches of Cappadocia, Galatia, and Bithynia.

But it is to Runnymede and to the events connected with the passing of the Magna Charta, we must turn for the most noteworthy illustration of the English Church as the defender of civil and religious liberty. John, the basest king that ever sat upon the throne of England, was guilty of the double sin of betraying, for his own personal aggrandisement, both the civil and religious liberty of the people of

England. When he failed to have his own creature appointed to the throne of Canterbury, he compromised with Innocent the Third, and in order to gain him over to his side, he consented to hold his crown and kingdom as a fief of the Roman See. The answer of the English Church people, headed by Stephen Langton, was in effect: "No Italian priest shall tithe or toll in our dominion."

Thomas Richey in "Presentation of the Anglican Church," *The World's Parliament of Religions.*

APPENDIX IV

The Independence of the Church of England

THE Church of England must ever look upon Anne Boleyn with downcast eyes full of sorrow and shame. By the influence of her charms, Henry was induced to take those steps which ended in setting the Church of England free from an uncatholic yoke; but that such a result should be produced by such an influence is a fact which must constrain us to think that the land was guilty of many sins, and that it was these national sins which prevented better instruments from being raised up for so righteous an object. . . . During the progress of the divorce business it had gradually been growing upon men's minds that whether the King was right or wrong in his endeavours to put away an old wife and take a young one in her place, the Pope was assuredly claiming a more than usually extravagant authority by the course which he was pursuing. . . .

It cannot but have been, indeed, that the papal office was brought into great disrepute by the miserable vices and secularity of those who occupied it; and for sixty years, to say no more, before the final breach was made, there had not been a Pope, except Clement VII., who could be called even a decent Christian. . . .

What jurisdiction the Papal See had over the Church of England was already rotting away before Henry VIII. laid the axe to its roots; and it was moral rottenness which made its destruction so comparatively easy. . . . If any

man will look down along the line of early English History, he will see a standing contest between the rulers of this land and the bishops of Rome. The Crown and Church of England, with a steady opposition, resisted the entrance and encroachment of the secularised ecclesiastical power of the Pope in England. The last rejection of it was no more than a successful effort after many a failure in struggles of the like kind. . . .

In petitioning the King [1531] to abolish one of the many payments exacted by the Pope [the Annates] the Convocation also prayed that in case his Holiness should persist in requiring such payments, the obedience of England should be withdrawn altogether from the See of Rome. . . .

This declaration of independence on the part of the Church of England originated with the clergy in the Convocation of 1531, and not with the King or the Parliament. . .

The appellate jurisdiction of the bishops of Rome originated in the just respect which was felt in early ages for their position as the first bishops of the Roman Empire and of Christendom itself. But appeals were then of a voluntary kind, having the nature of applications for advice rather than that of applications for judicial decisions.

JOHN HENRY BLUNT.

APPENDIX V

The Organic Continuity of the Church of England

THE Reformers never for an instant professed to be abolishing the old Church of England and founding a new one. . . . It was always recognised by her rulers that the vital organism of a Church consists of three things: (1) an Apostolically descended Episcopate, (2) a Sacerdotal Ministry, and (3) valid Sacraments. In these three particulars the Church of England has always been conspicuously distinguished from every Protestant community, English or foreign; and in these three particulars the Reformed Church of England is as entirely identical with the pre-Reformation Church of England as a man who is at one time in sickness and at another in health is the same man, or as a vine which has been pruned is the same vine that it was before it was pruned. . . .

In accordance with this Reformation principle the greatest possible care has always been used to keep the episcopal succession unbroken. The Mediæval Church held its title to that succession by several lines of spiritual ancestry, but most distinctly of all, by one line which descended from the Apostles to Archbishop Theodore (A.D. 668–690) through the earlier bishops of Rome, all of whose names are historically known, and by another line which descended from the Apostles through the bishops of France to Archbishop Berthwald (A.D. 693–731). From the Mediæval Church the succession descended to Archbishop Cranmer and his contemporaries through nearly a thousand bishops. . . .

A crisis involving some danger arose in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, when most of the Marian bishops refused to take part in the consecration of others; but this crisis was safely passed by the consecration of Archbishop Parker, Bishops Grindal, Cox, Meyrick, and Sandys, at the hands of Bishops Barlow, Hodgkins, Coverdale, and Scory, all of whom had been bishops before Queen Mary's accession, and the first two of whom had been consecrated long before the death of Henry VIII. . . .

Strict provision was made for the continuation of the ancient sacerdotal order as well as for the continuation of the ancient episcopal order. . . .

JOHN HENRY BLUNT.

APPENDIX VI

The Nag's Head Fable

THE consecration of Parker brought him into a direct lineal succession with the mediæval bishops, and therefore with the primitive bishops of the Church of England, and also, singular to say, with the Bishops of Rome, for Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale had been consecrated by Cranmer, Hilsey, Stokesley, and others, while one of the bishops, Clerk of Bath and Wells, who took part with Cranmer and Voysey in the consecration of Barlow, had been consecrated at Rome by Roman bishops. . .

But as the Episcopal succession of the Reformed Church of England was thus made for a time to depend on a single link of the chain, a great temptation fell in the way of unscrupulous controversialists to show that this link did not really exist, and that consequently there was no continuity of Apostolic Succession between the ancient and the Reformed Church. A story was therefore trumped up in the year 1604 by a Roman Catholic priest named Holywood, or more sonorously, John de Sacrobosco, to the effect that Parker's alleged consecration had been a mere burlesque ceremony, performed at a tavern in Cheapside known by the name of the Nag's Head. This story, repeated with varying details by multitudes of Roman Catholic writers, until it was repudiated by Dr. Lingard, alleged that those who were nominated to bishoprics by Queen Elizabeth all met at the Cheapside tavern, where Scory, having been inhibited by Bonner from performing

any episcopal functions within the Diocese of London, hastily laid a Bible on Parker, bidding him rise up Archbishop of Canterbury, Parker then doing the same to Scory and the rest.

It is marvellous that any writers with the least sense of responsibility should have printed and reprinted so strange a story without adducing a scrap of contemporary evidence in support of it. The fiction was never heard of until forty-five years after Parker became Archbishop of Canterbury, and was opposed to all the well known and recorded circumstances of the case. But when attention was drawn to this fiction, a mass of documentary evidence was produced which placed the consecration at Lambeth beyond a doubt. This, with some additions, has been collected together in a most authentic form in recent times.

The truth is that very elaborate care was taken by the Queen and her advisers to secure at every point the legal form of Archbishop Parker's appointment.

Appendices IV, V, and VI are from *The Reformation of the Church of England*, by John Henry Blunt. London, Rivingtons. New York, E. & J. B. Young & Co. Later authorities, such as Richard Watson Dixon and John Stockton Littell, concur in the statements more concisely given in the earlier authority.

THE TESTIMONY

Of Representative begins on page 48; of Militant on page 56; of Romanus on page 57; of Magnate on page 58; of Objector on page 73; of Encourager on page 75; of Protest on page 93; of Greatheart on page 106; of Luthrem on page 125; of Anglic on page 129; of Conservative on page 152; of Presbus on page 158; of Method on page 177; of Radic on page 190; of the Plain Business Man on page 196; of Wouldbe on page 208; of Bapto on page 223; of Baptizo on page 226; of Puritan on page 231; of Pilgrim on page 233; of Zelotes on page 269; of Zealot on page 256; of the Friends of Anglic on page 264; of the Doctor on page 303; of the Old Man on page 324.

Date Due

6-11

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BX
8
K67
40238
AUTHOR
Knauff, T.C.
TITLE
Other sheep I have.
DATE LOANED
BORROWER'S NAME
DATE RETURNED